arXiv:math/0507568v1 [math.AP] 27 Jul 2005

ON COMPLETE CHARACTERIZATION OF COEFFICIENTS OF A.E. CONVERGING ORTHOGONAL SERIES

Adam Paszkiewicz (Łódź)

Abstract. We characterize sequences of numbers (a_n) such that $\sum_{n\geq 1} a_n\Phi_n$ converges a.e. for any orthonormal system (Φ_n) in any L_2-space. In our criterion, we use the set $B=\{\sum_{m\geq n}|a_m|^2; n\geq 1\}$ and its information function

$$h_B(t) = -\log_3(\beta-\alpha)$$

for $t\in(\alpha,\beta]$, $[\alpha,\beta]\cap B=\{\alpha,\beta\}$.

1. Introduction. The aim of this paper is to give a complete characterization of sequences (a_n) for which

$$(*) \qquad \sum a_n\Phi_n \quad \text{converges a.e. for any orthonormal sequence } (\Phi_n)$$

(O.N. for short) in any L_2 space.

The celebrated Rademacher-Menshov theorem gives complete characterization of so called Weil coefficients r_n, $n\geq 1$, for which the convergence

$$\sum r_n|a_n|^2<\infty, \quad a_n\in\mathbb{C}$$

implies (*). Namely increasing r_n's *are* Weil coefficients if the sequence $r_n/\log_2^2 n$ is bounded and *are not* Weil coefficients if $r_n/\log_2^2 n\to\infty$.

The theorem, however, does not give complete characterization of sequences (a_n) such that (*) is satisfied. Some weaker sufficient conditions was obtained by Talagrand [5], Moric and Tandori [3], and by Weber [6]. But the problem of a complete charcayerization was still open, as was stressed, in particular, in [5].

Key words and phrases. orthogonal series, Rademacher-Menshov theorem, Tandori theorem, information of partition of interval.

2001 Mathematical Subject Classification: Primary 40A30, 42C15. Secondary 60G07, 94A17.

Let us assume for simplicity that $\sum |a_n|^2 = 1$, and denote by h_B the information function of the partition of $(0,1]$ given by $B = \{\sum_{m\geq n} a_m^2; n \geq 1\}$. More precisely, $h_B : (0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is given by

$$h_B(t) = -\log_3(\beta - \alpha) \quad \text{for } t \in (\alpha, \beta]$$

with $[\alpha, \beta] \cap B = \{\alpha, \beta\}$.

For technical reasons we use $\log_3$ instead of (the more standard) $\log_2$. In the whole paper $||\ ||$ denotes L_2-norm. Sometimes $||\ ||$ is used on L_0^+-spaces, the infinite value of $||\ ||$ is then possible.

In our investigation of information function the following notions are crucial:

1.1. Notation. In the space $(0,1]$ with Lebesgue measure λ, let $\mathcal{F}_i$ be the σ-field generated by

$$\{(0, n3^{-2^i}]; \quad 1 \leq n \leq 3^{2^i}\}$$

and let $||\ ||_i$ be the conditional L_2-norm

$$||h||_i = (\mathbb{E}(h^2|\mathcal{F}_i))^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad h \geq 0,$$

taking values in $[0, \infty]$

We also put

$$Vh = \lim_{i\to\infty} ||V_0 \dots V_i h||$$

with

$$V_j h = (h \wedge 2^j) + ||(h - 2^j)^+||_j.$$

□

1.2. Theorem. *For $\sum_{n\geq 1} |a_n|^2 = 1$, $B = \{\sum_{m\geq n} |a_m|^2; n \geq 1\}$ and $h_B(t) = -\log_3(\beta - \alpha)$ if $t \in (\alpha, \beta]$, $[\alpha, \beta] \cap B = \{\alpha, \beta\}$, we have:*

A. *Condition (*) is equivalent to $Vh_B < \infty$.*

B. *The existence of an O.N.-system (Φ_n) in $L_2[0,1]$ with $\sum a_n \Phi_n$ diverging a.e. is equivalent to $Vh_B = \infty$.*

The proof requires many steps (Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5). Applications of Theorem 1.2 are presented in Section 6. In particular, an a.s. continuity of processes with orthogonal increments in L_2 space of random variables is described there.

It is worth to compare our condition $Vh_B < \infty$ with some formulations of Tandori criterion of unconditional convergence of orthogonal series, and with Moric Tandori criterium of convergence of orthogonal series $\sum a_n\Phi_n$ with decreasing coefficients a_n.

Namely, by the classical Tandori theorem,

(**) $\qquad \sum a_{\sigma(n)}\Phi_n$ converges a.e. for any permutation $(a_{\sigma(n)})$ of (a_n)

and any O.N.-system (Φ_n) if only

$$\sum_i \Big(\sum_{2^{2^i}\le n<2^{2^{i+1}}} |a_n|^2 \log_2^2 n\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

Moreover, there exists an O.N.-system (Φ_n) such that for any sequence $\lambda_i \ge 0$, $\sum_{i\ge 1}\lambda_i = \infty$, there exist numbers (a_n) and permutation $a_{\sigma(n)}$, $n \ge 1$, satisfying

$$\Big(\sum_{2^{2^i}\le n<2^{2^{i+1}}} |a_n|^2 \log_2^2 n\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \lambda_i, \quad i \ge 1,$$

and

$$\sum a_{\sigma(n)}\Phi_n \quad \text{diverges a.e.}$$

(see [2], and [4] for simplified proof).

It is known that the following conditions, formulated by the use of *distribution of magnitude* of $|a_n|$ only, can be obtained from the Rademacher-Menshov and Tandori theorems in a rather simple way (see [3]).

1.3. Theorem. *For decreasing modules $|a_n|$, condition (*) is equivalent to*

(α) $$\sum_{n\ge 1} |a_n|^2 \log_2^2 |a_n| < \infty.$$

1.4. Theorem. *For any sequence (a_n), condition (**) is equivalent to*

(β) $$\sum_{i\ge 1}\Big(\sum_{\substack{n\ge 1\\ 2^{-2^{i+1}}\le |a_n|<2^{-2^i}}} |a_n|^2 \log_2^2 |a_n|\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

Assuming, for simplicity, that $a_n \ge 0$ for $n \ge 1$, we have another formutation of (β).

1.5. Proposition. *For $a_n \geq 0$, condition (β) is equivalent to*

$$(\gamma) \qquad \sum_{i\geq 1}(\sum_{n\geq 1} a_n^2(-\log_2 a_n)_i^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$$

where we use the notation

$$z_i = z \wedge 2^{i+1} - z \wedge 2^i, \quad i \geq 1,$$

for any positive number z.

Proof. Relations between formulas of type (β) and (γ) are well-known but we recall here an elementary proof.

Let $u_i = 1_{\{n;2^i \leq -\log_2 a_n < 2^{i+1}\}} \in L_2(\mathbb{N}, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, \mu)$, on measure space $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ with $\mu = \sum_n a_n^2 \delta_n$. In this formula, δ_n is a Dirac measure concentrated in n. Then $u_1, u_2, \dots$ are orthogonal vectors in L_2 with $\sum ||u_i||^2 < \infty$, and

$$A^- \leq \sum_{i\geq 1}(\sum_{n\geq 1} a_n^2(-\log_2 a_n)_i^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq A^+.$$

$$B^- \leq \sum_{i\geq 1}(\sum_{\substack{n\geq 1 \\ 2^{-2^{i+1}} < a_n \leq 2^{-2^i}}} a_n^2 \log_2^2 a_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq B^+,$$

for

$$A^- = \sum_{i\geq 1} 2^i ||u_{i+1} + u_{i+2} + \dots||,$$

$$A^+ = \sum_{i\geq 1} 2^i ||u_i + u_{i+1} + \dots||,$$

$$B^- = \sum_{i\geq 1} 2^i ||u_i||,$$

$$B^+ = \sum_{i\geq 1} 2^{i+1} ||u_i||.$$

Then $A^- < \infty \iff A^+ < \infty$, $B^- < \infty \iff B^+ < \infty$, and

$$B^- \leq A^+ \leq \sum_{i\geq 1} 2^i(||u_i|| + ||u_{i+1}|| + \dots) = \sum_{j\geq 1}(2 + \dots + 2^j)||u_j|| \leq B^+.$$

□

Let us observe, that all conditions $(\alpha), (\beta), (\gamma)$ can be formulated using information function of a partition of some interval. Once more, assume for simplicity that $\sum |a_n|^2 = 1$ and denote $B = \{\sum_{m\geq n} |a_n|^2; n \geq 1\}$. Let $I_B\colon (1,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be given by

$$I_B(t) = -\log_2(\beta - \alpha) \quad \text{for} \quad t \in (\alpha, \beta]$$

with $[\alpha, \beta] \cap B = \{\alpha, \beta\}$.

Let us fix the following

1.6. Notation. We write

$$f_0 = f \wedge 2, \quad f_i = (f \wedge 2^{i+1}) - (f \wedge 2^i), \quad i \geq 1$$

for any positive function f.

Gist of the matter given in Theorems 1.3, 1.4 is contained in

1.7. Theorem. *A. For any decreasing sequence $a_n \searrow 0$, $\sum a_n^2 = 1$, the condition (*) is equivalent to*

$$(\alpha_1) \qquad ||I_B|| < \infty.$$

B. For any $a_n > 0$, $\sum a_n^2 = 1$, the conditions (**),

$$(\beta_1) \qquad \sum_{i\geq 1} ||I_B 1_{(2^i \leq H_B < 2^{i+1})}|| < \infty,$$

$$(\gamma_1) \qquad \sum_{i\geq 1} ||(I_B)_i|| < \infty$$

are equivalent.

The equivalence of (β_1) and (γ_1) is given by 1.5.

For a not necessarily decreasing, sequence $a_n \geq 0$, condition (α_1) is too weak and (γ_1) is too strong to characterize the phenomenon (*). It turns out that $VI_B < \infty$ is a proper, intermediate, condition. Obviously we use $\log_3$ instead $\log_2$ and h_B instead I_B for technical reasons only.

2. Fundamental lemma for construction of divergent orthogonal series. In this section we point out that some orthogonal sequences ϕ_n, $1 \leq n \leq N$, in $L_2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $\sum_{1\leq n\leq N} ||\phi_n||^2 = 1$, have majorants

$$M = \max_{1\leq n\leq N}(\phi_1 + \cdots + \phi_n)$$

of logarithmic magnitude:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} M^2 d\lambda \geq k \log^2 N$$

for some constant $k > 0$. We should describe this phenomenon in a specific way suitable for further, rather complicated calculations. Special properties of the final sum $\phi_1 + \cdots + \phi_N$ will also be needed. That is why we don't use the classical constructions based on properties of Hilbert matrices (cf. [2]). Our Lemma 2.1. is obtained by the use of tertiary expansions of numbers and improves some results in [4].

We fix some notation used throughout the section. For $x \in [0, 1)$, we write

$$x = \frac{x_1}{3} + \frac{x_2}{3^2} + \ldots, \quad x_k = 0, 1, 2,\ x_k \nrightarrow 2.$$

Each x_k is identified with a function $x_k(x) = x_k$ on $[0, 1)$. We use the probabilistic notation where, for example, $(x_k = 1) = \{x : x_k(x) = 1\}$. For a fixed k and any $n = 0, \ldots, 3^k - 1$, we write

$$n = n_1 3^{k-1} + \cdots + n_k 3^0, \quad n_k = 0, 1, 2,$$

In the proof of our fundamental lemma we also use the special convention that

$$\begin{aligned} &\widehat{0} = 0, \quad \widehat{1} = 1, \quad \widehat{2} = -1, \\ &\widehat{3p + m} = \widehat{m} \text{ for } p \in \mathbb{Z},\ m = 0, 1, 2. \end{aligned} \tag{0}$$

In other words

$$\widehat{m} \equiv m \pmod 3, \quad \widehat{m} = -1, 0, 1, \quad \text{for } m \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

2.1. Fundamental Lemma. *Let $k = 1, 2, \dots$ be fixed. For any function $\chi \in L_2(\mathbb{R})$, $\chi 1_{[0,1)} = 0$, $||\chi||^2 = 1$, there exist functions ϕ_n, $0 \le n < 3^k$, satisfying*

$$\phi_n \text{ are mutually orthogonal, } ||\phi_n||^2 = \frac{3}{3^k}; \tag{1}$$

$$\langle \phi_n, 1_{[0,1)} \rangle = 0, \quad \sum_{0 \le n < 3^k} \phi_n 1_{[0,1)} = 0; \tag{2}$$

$$\phi_n 1_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [0,1)} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3^k} \chi, \tag{3}$$

in particular $\sum_{0 \le n < 3^k} \phi_n = \sqrt{3}\chi$;

$$\max_{0 \le n < 3^k} (\phi_0 + \dots + \phi_n) = \sum_{1 \le l \le k} 1_{(x_l = 1)}. \tag{4}$$

Moreover,

$$\phi_0 + \dots + \phi_{n-1} = \sum_{1 \le l \le k} 1_{(x_l = 1)} \tag{5}$$

and

$$\phi_n = 0 \tag{6}$$

for $x \in [\frac{n}{3^k}, \frac{n+1}{3^k})$, $0 \le n < 3^k$.

Proof. It is enough to take

$$\phi_n = \frac{1}{3^k}(\sqrt{3}\chi + 3\widehat{x_1 - n_1} + 3^2 1_{(x_1 = n_1)} \widehat{x_2 - n_2} + \dots + 3^k 1_{(x_1 = n_1, \dots x_{k-1} = n_{k-1})} \widehat{x_k - n_k}).$$

To obtain (1) and to make the last formula more familiar, we start with some properties of functions $1_{(x_1 - n_1, \dots, x_{l-1} = n_{l-1})} \widehat{x_l - n_l}$, $1 \le l \le k$. According to our notation, let $n' = n'_1 3^{k-1} + \dots + n'_k 3^0$, $n'_l = 0, 1, 2$. For symbol $\widehat{\ }$ given by (0), we have

$$||\widehat{x_1 - n_1}||^2 = \frac{2}{3}, \quad \langle \widehat{x_1 - n_1}, \widehat{x_1 - n'_1} \rangle = -\frac{1}{3}$$

for $n_1 \ne n'_1$ and

$$||1_{(x_1 = n_1, \dots, x_{l-1} = n_{l-1})} \widehat{x_l - n_l}||^2 = \frac{2}{3^l},$$

$$\langle 1_{(x_1=n_1,\dots,x_{l-1}=n_{l-1})}\widehat{x_l-n_l}, 1_{(x_1=n_1,\dots,x_{l-1}=n_{l-1})}\widehat{x_l-n'_l}\rangle = -\frac{1}{3^l}$$

for $n_l \neq n'_l$, $1 \leq l \leq k$. Moreover $\langle \widehat{x_1-n_1}, 1_{[0,1)}\rangle = 0$, $\langle \widehat{x_l-n_l}, 1_{(x_1=n_1,\dots,x_{l-1}=n_{l-1})}\rangle = 0$ and

$$\langle 1_{(x_1=n_1,\dots,x_{l-1}=n_{l-1})}\widehat{x_l-n_l}, 1_{(x_1=n'_1,\dots,x_{l'-1}=n'_{l'-1})}\widehat{x_{l'}-n_{l'}}\rangle = 0$$

for $l \neq l'$. The orthogonality

$$\langle 1_{(x_1=n_1,\dots,x_{l-1}=n_{l-1})}\widehat{x_l-n_l}, 1_{(x_1=n'_1,\dots,x_{l-1}=n'_{l-1})}\widehat{x_l-n'_l}\rangle = 0$$

for $(n_1,\dots,n_{l-1}) \neq (n'_1,\dots,n'_{l-1})$ is also obvious.

Thus, for $n \neq n'$ with $(n_1,\dots,n_{l-1}) = (n'_1,\dots,n'_{l-1})$, $n_l \neq n'_l$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \phi_n, \phi_{n'}\rangle = \frac{1}{3^{2k}}(&||\sqrt{3}\chi||^2\\ &+ 3^2||\widehat{x_1-n_1}||^2 + \cdots + 3^{2l-2}||1_{(x_1=n_1,\dots,x_{l-2}=n_{l-2})}\widehat{x_{l-1}-n_{l-1}}||^2\\ &+ 3^{2l}\langle 1_{(x_1=n_1,\dots,x_{l-1}=n_{l-1})}\widehat{x_l-n_l}, 1_{(x_1=n_1,\dots,x_{l-1}=n_{l-1})}\widehat{x_l-n'_l}\rangle)\\ &= \frac{1}{3^{2k}}(3 + 3^2\cdot\frac{2}{3} + \cdots + 3^{2l-2}\frac{2}{3^{l-1}} - 3^{2l}\frac{1}{3^l}) = 0,\end{aligned}$$

and analogously

$$||\phi_n||^2 = \frac{1}{3^{2k}}(3 + 3^2\cdot\frac{2}{3} + \cdots + 3^{2k}\frac{2}{3^k}) = \frac{3}{3^k}.$$

Condition (1) is thus proved.

Conditions (2) and (3) are obvious, by the definition of ϕ_n and because

$$\sum_{n_1=0,1,2} \widehat{x_1-n_1} = 0,$$

$$\sum_{n_l=0,1,2} 1_{(x_1=n_1,\dots,x_{l-1}=n_{l_1})}\widehat{x_l-n_l} = 0$$

for any fixed l, $n_1,\dots,n_{l-1}$.

To obtain (4), it is enough to observe that

$$1_{(x_1=m_1)}\widehat{x_1-m_1} \equiv 0 \text{ for } m_1 = 0,1,2.$$

Thus

$$1_{(x_1=n_1,\dots,x_l=n_l)}\widehat{x_l-n_l} \equiv 0$$

and

$$1_{[\frac{n}{3^k},\frac{n+1}{3^k})}\widehat{x_l-n_l}=1_{(x_1=n_1,\dots,x_k=n_k)}\widehat{x_l-n_l}\equiv 0.$$

The proof of (4) and (5) is more difficult. We give it with details. We list here the basic properties of the symbol '$\widehat{\ }$'. We have, for $\lambda\in[0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda\widehat{x_1-0}&\le 1_{(x_1=1)} \quad \text{for } x\in[0,1),\\ \lambda\widehat{x_1-0}&= 1_{(x_1=1)} \quad \text{for } x\in[0,\frac{1}{3});\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{x_1-0}+\lambda\widehat{x_1-1}&\le 1_{(x_1=1)} \quad \text{for } x\in[0,1),\\ \widehat{x_1-0}+\lambda\widehat{x_1-1}&= 1_{(x_1=1)} \quad \text{for } x\in[\frac{1}{3},\frac{2}{3});\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{x_1-0}+\widehat{x_1-1}+\lambda\widehat{x_1-2}&\le 1_{(x_1=1)} \quad \text{for } x\in[0,1),\\ \widehat{x_1-0}+\widehat{x_1-1}+\lambda\widehat{x_1-2}&= 1_{(x_1=1)} \quad \text{for } x\in[\frac{2}{3},1);\end{aligned}$$

$$\widehat{x_1-0}+\widehat{x_1-1}+\widehat{x_1-2}= 0 \quad \text{for } x\in[0,1).$$

More generally, for $0\le l\le k$, $\lambda\in[0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda\widehat{x_l-0}&\le 1_{(x_l=1)} \quad \text{for } x\in[0,1),\\ \lambda\widehat{x_l-0}&= 1_{(x_l=1)} \quad \text{for } x\in(x_l=0);\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{x_l-0}+\lambda\widehat{x_l-1}&\le 1_{(x_l=1)} \quad \text{for } x\in[0,1),\\ \widehat{x_l-0}+\lambda\widehat{x_l-1}&= 1_{(x_l=1)} \quad \text{for } x\in(x_l=1);\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{x_l-0}+\widehat{x_l-1}+\lambda\widehat{x_l-2}&\le 1_{(x_l=1)} \quad \text{for } x\in[0,1),\\ \widehat{x_l-0}+\widehat{x_l-1}+\lambda\widehat{x_l-2}&= 1_{(x_l=1)} \quad \text{for } x\in(x_l=2);\end{aligned}$$

$$\widehat{x_l-0}+\widehat{x_l-1}+\widehat{x_l-2}= 0 \quad \text{for } x\in[0,1).$$

For any $m=0,\dots,3^k-1$, $m=m_1 3^{k-1}+\cdots+m_k 3^0$, we write also $m=[m_1,\dots,m_k]$ with $m_l=0,1,2$, in particular, $[2,\dots,2]=3^k-1$. Then, for

$1 \le l \le k$, $x \in [0,1)$,

$$\sum_{[n_1,\dots,n_{l-1},0,\dots,0]\le m\le[n_1,\dots,n_{l-1},0,n_{l+1},\dots,n_k]} \widehat{x_l - m_l} = (n_{l+1}3^{k-l-1} + \cdots + n_k 3^0)\widehat{x_l - 0} \le 3^{k-l}1_{(x_l=1)} \tag{7}$$

with equality for $x \in (x_l = 0)$,

and similarly

$$\sum_{[n_1,\dots,n_{l-1},0,\dots,0]\le m\le[n_1,\dots,n_{l-1},1,n_{l+1},\dots,n_k]} \widehat{x_l - m_l} \le 3^{k-l}1_{(x_l=1)} \tag{8}$$

with equality for $x \in (x_l = 1)$,

$$\sum_{[n_1,\dots,n_{l-1},0,\dots,0]\le m\le[n_1,\dots,n_{l-1},2,n_{l+1},\dots,n_k]} \widehat{x_l - m_l} \le 3^{k-l}1_{(x_l=1)} \tag{9}$$

with equality for $x \in (x_l = 2)$.

Moreover,

$$\sum_{[n_1,\dots,n_{l-1},0,\dots,0]\le m\le[n_1,\dots,n_{l-1},2,\dots,2]} \widehat{x_l - m_l} = 3^{k-l}(\widehat{x_l - 0} + \widehat{x_l - 1} + \widehat{x_l - 2}) = 0. \tag{10}$$

Both conditions (4) and (5) are consequences of

$$\sum_{0\le m<n} 1_{(x_1=m_1,\dots,x_{l-1}=m_{l-1})}\widehat{x_l - m_l} \le 3^{k-l}1_{(x_l=1)} \quad \text{with equality for } x \in (x_1 = n_1, \dots, x_l = n_l). \tag{11}$$

Indeed, recall that $x \in [\frac{n}{3^k}, \frac{n+1}{3^k}) \iff (x_1 = n_1, \dots, x_k = n_k)$.

We prove relations (11) separately on each fixed interval $x \in (x_1 = n'_1, \dots, x_{l-1} = n'_{l-1})$; thus we prove that

$$\sum_{\substack{0\le m<n \\ [n'_1,\dots,n'_{l-1},0,\dots,0]\le m\le[n'_1,\dots,n'_{l-1},2,\dots,2]}} 1_{(x_1=m_1,\dots x_{l-1}=m_{l-1})}\widehat{x_l - m_l} \le 3^{k-l}1_{(x_l=1)} \tag{12}$$

with equality if only $x_1 = n_1 = n'_1, \dots, x_{l-1} = n_{l-1} = n'_{l-1}, x_l = n_l$.

We discuss three cases:

1^o Assume that $[n_1,\dots,n_{l-1},0,\dots,0] < [n'_1,\dots,n'_{l-1},0,\dots,0]$. Then we have zero summands in (12) and everything is obvious.

2^o Assume that $[n_1,\dots,n_{l-1},0,\dots,0] > [n'_1,\dots,n'_{l-1},0,\dots,0]$. Then the sum can be be written as

$$\sum_{[n'_1,\dots,n'_{l-1},0,\dots,0]\le m\le[n'_1,\dots,n'_{l-1},2,\dots,2]} 1_{(x_1=n'_1,\dots,n'_{l-1}=n'_{l-1})}\widehat{x_l - m_l}$$

and it equals 0 by (10).

3^o Assume that $n_1 = n'_1,\dots,n_{l-1} = n'_{l-1}$. Then the sum in (12) equals

$$\sum_{[n_1,\dots,n_{l-1},0,\dots,0]\le m<[n_1,\dots,n_{l-1},n_l\dots,n_k]} 1_{(x_1=m_1,\dots,m_{l-1}=n'_{l-1})}\widehat{x_l - m_l}.$$

The required relations can be obtained from (7) if $n_l = 0$, from (8) if $n_l = 1$, and from (9) if $n_l = 2$. The proof is finished. □

For large l the function $\sum_{1\le l\le k} 1_{(x_l=1)}$ approximates $\frac{1}{3}k$. By Bernstein inequality we have in particular

2.2. Lemma. *For $x = \frac{x_1}{3} + \frac{x_2}{3^2} + \dots$, $x_l = 0,1,2$, we have*

$$\lambda\Big(\sum_{1\le l\le k} 1_{(x_l=1)} < \frac{1}{6}k\Big) \le e^{-k/144}.$$

Proof. The left-hand side equals $P(\frac{1}{k}S_k - p < -\epsilon)$ for the Bernoulli random variable S_k with probability of success $p = \frac{1}{3}$, and for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{6}$. Thus classical inequality $P(\frac{1}{k}S_k - p < -\epsilon) \le e^{-k\epsilon^2/4}$ (see [1]) can be used.

3. Consequences of the fundamental lemma for triadic sets. In the rest of the paper (excluding Section 6) B is always a set satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} &\{0,1\} \subset B \subset [0,1],\\ &\sharp B \cap [\alpha,1] < \infty \quad \text{for any } \alpha > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

3.1. Definition. We say that a set B satisfying (13) is *triadic* if

$$B = \bigcup_{(i,n)\in I} \{n3^{-2^i}, (n+1)3^{-2^i}\}$$

for a set I of pairs (i,n) $i \ge 0$, $0 \le n < 3^{2^i}$ and

$$(n3^{-2^i}, (n+1)3^{-2^i}) \cap B \ne \emptyset \quad \text{implies} \quad \{n3^{-2^i}, (n+1)3^{-2^i}\} \subset B,$$

for any $i \ge 0$, $0 \le n < 3^{2^i}$. We also assume that $\{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, 1\} \subset B$.

3.2. Definition. We say that $X : B \to L_2(\mathbb{R})$ is an *orthogonal process* if $X(0) = 0$ and

$$||X(t) - X(s)||^2 = t - s \quad \text{for any } 0 \le s < t \le 1.$$

Sometimes we have $X(B) \subset L_2[a, b)$; then $L_2[a, b)$ is identified with the space of functions vanishing on outside of $[a, b)$.

3.3. Basic lemma for a finite triadic set. There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that, for any finite triadic set B and any $y > 1$, if $Vh_B > cy$ then

$$\lambda([0, 1) \setminus (\max_{t\in B} X(t) > y)) < \frac{1}{2}$$

for some orthogonal process X.

Thus in this section we discuss a *fixed finite triadic set* B. We need a number of auxiliary lemmas and notations connected with B.

3.4. Definition. We say that D is simple, and we write $D \in \mathcal{S}^B$, if D is a finite union of closed intervals with end points in B.

3.5. Definition. Let $D \in \mathcal{S}^B$. We say that X is a *simple process* on D, and we write $X \in \mathcal{P}^B_D$, if $X : D \cap B \to L_2(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$||X(t) - X(s)||^2 = 3 \cdot 24^2 \lambda([s, t] \cap D), \quad s, t, \in D \cap B;$$

$$X(\alpha) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \alpha = \min D.$$

For any orthogonal process X on B and $D = [\alpha, \beta]$, $\{\alpha, \beta\} \in B$, the renormalized process $Y(t) = 24\sqrt{3}(X(t) - X(\alpha))$ defined on $D \cap B$ is a simple process on D.

3.6. Definition. For a given $y > 0$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we say that a simple set D is a set of (ϵ, y) – complexity for B, and we write $D \in \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon, y)$, if for any interval $[a, b)$ and any $\chi \in L_2(Z)$, $||\chi|| = 1$, $Z \cap [a, b) = \emptyset$, there exists simple process on D satisfying

$$X(\max D) = 24\sqrt{3\lambda(D)}\chi,$$

$$\lambda([a, b) \setminus (\max_{t\in D\cap B} X(t) \ge \frac{y}{\sqrt{b - a}})) < \epsilon(b - a),$$

$$X(t) \in L_2([a,b]) \cup Z) \quad \text{for } t \in D \cap B.$$

3.7. Example. By Lemmas 2.1, 2.2 we have

$$[0,1] \in \mathcal{S}^B(e^{-k/144}, 4k) \tag{14}$$

if only $\{m3^{-k}; 0 \le m \le 3^k\} \subset B$. Namely, for $[a,b) = [0,1)$, $\chi \in L_2(Z)$, $||\chi|| = 1$, $Z \cap [0,1) = \emptyset$, it is enough to take

$$\tilde{X}(m3^{-k}) = 24(\phi_0 + \cdots + \phi_{m-1}), \quad 0 \le m \le 3^k,$$

and then extend $\tilde{X}$ to a simple process

$$X : B \to L_2([0,1) \cup Z).$$

For an arbitrary interval $[a,b)$, it is enough to take $\phi_n(\frac{t-a}{b-a})/\sqrt{b-a}$ instead of $\phi_n(t)$ (after suitable rearangement of X and Z).

It is also obvious that

3.8. Example. $[\alpha,\beta] \in \mathcal{S}^B(e^{-k/144}, 4k\sqrt{\beta-\alpha})$ if only $\{\alpha + m(\beta-\alpha)3^{-k};\ 0 \le m \le 3^k\} \subset B$.

Moreover, let $D = \bigcup_{0 \le n < 3^k} \delta_n$ with δ_n being closed intervals from $\mathcal{S}^B$ (with end points in B), with mutually disjoint interiors and with $\lambda(\delta_n) = \eta$. Then

$$D \in \mathcal{S}^B(e^{-k/144}, \quad 4k\sqrt{\lambda(D)}). \tag{15}$$

3.9. Remark. The multiplier 4 in formulas (14), (15) and their just comming generalizations is suitable in further, more complicated considerations. This is the only reason of using the strangely looking constant $3 \cdot 24^2$ in Definition 3.5.

The goal of this section is to show that, for some $C > 0$

$$||Vh_B|| > Cy \quad \text{implies} \quad [0,1] \in \mathcal{S}^B(\frac{1}{2}, y) \tag{16}$$

for any $y \ge 1$. Then Lemma 3.3 is proved.

We need more delicate consequences of Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2. Let us observe that

$$\mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon, y) \subset \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon_1, y_1)$$

for $\epsilon_1 \ge \epsilon$, $y_1 \le y$, and

3.10. Lemma. *If sets $D_1, \dots, D_L$ have mutually disjoint interiors and $D_l \in \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon, y_l)$, $1 \le l \le L$, then*

$$\bigcup_{1\le l\le L} D_l \in \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon, \sqrt{\sum_{1\le l\le L} y_l^2}).$$

Proof. For any interval $[a,b)$ and any function $\chi \in L_2(Z)$, $||\chi|| = 1$, let us take a partition

$$[a,b) = [a_1,b_1) \cup \dots \cup [a_L,b_L)$$

with disjoint intervals satisfying

$$\frac{b_l - a_l}{b-a} = y_l^2 / \sum_{1\le l'\le L} y_{l'}^2 \quad \text{for } 1 \le l \le L,$$

and a decomposition

$$\chi = \sum_{1\le l\le L} \frac{\sqrt{\lambda(D_l)}}{\sqrt{\lambda(\bigcup_{l'} D_{l'})}} \chi_l$$

with some orthonormal system $(\chi_1, \dots, \chi_L)$ in $L_2(Z)$. By assumption, there exist simple processes $X_l \in \mathcal{P}^B_{D_l}$ such that

$$\lambda([a_l,b_l) \setminus (\max_{t\in D\cap B} X(t) \ge \frac{y_l}{\sqrt{b_l - a_l}})) < \epsilon(b_l - a_l),$$

$$X_l(\max D_l) = 24\sqrt{3}\sqrt{\lambda(D_l)}\chi_l,$$

$$X_l(t) \in L_2([a_l,b_l) \cup Z),$$

for $1 \le l \le L$. It is enough to take

$$X(t) = \sum_{1\le l\le L} X_l(\max(D_l \cap [0,t]))$$

for $t \in D \cap B$. □

3.11. Lemma. *Let $D = \bigcup_{0\le n<3^k} \delta_n$, δ_n being closed intervals from $\mathcal{S}^B$, with mutually disjoint interiors. If $\lambda(\delta_n) = \eta$ and $\delta_n \in \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon, y)$, $0 \le n < 3^k$, then*

$$D \subset \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon + e^{-k/144}, 3^{k/2}y + 4k\sqrt{\lambda(D)}).$$

Proof. One can assume, by a suitable change of notations, that $\delta_n = [\alpha_n, \beta_n]$, $\beta_n \le \alpha_{n+1}$, $0 \le n < 3^k - 1$. Take for simplicity $[a, b) = [0, 1)$ and $\chi \in L_2(Z)$, $||\chi|| = 1$, $[0, 1) \cap Z = \emptyset$. By Lemma 2.1, there exist functions ϕ_n satisfying

$$||\phi_n||^2 = 3 \cdot 24^2 \eta, \quad \phi_n \in L_2[0, 1) \cup Z,$$

and also

$$\phi_n \perp L_2[n3^{-k}, (n+1)3^{-k}),$$

for $0 \le n < 3^k$. Moreover

$$\sum \phi_n = 24\sqrt{3 \cdot 3^k \eta}\chi = 24\sqrt{3\lambda(D)}\chi,$$

$$(\phi_0 + \cdots + \phi_{n-1})(x) = \sum_{1 \le i \le k} 1_{(x_i = 1)}(x) \quad \text{for } x \in [n3^{-k}, (n+1)3^{-k}),$$

for any $0 \le n < 3^k$.

For a given $0 \le n < 3^k$, we use our assumption $\delta_n \in \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon, y_n)$ with $[a, b) = [n3^{-k}, (n+1)3^{-k})$, $\chi = \phi_n / ||\phi_n|| \in L_2([0, n3^{-k}) \cup [(n+1)3^{-k}, 1) \cup Z)$ and we obtain a simple process X_n on $\delta_n \cap B$, $X_n \in \mathcal{P}^B_{\delta_n}$, $X_n(\alpha_n) = 0$, $X_n(\beta_n) = \phi_n$,

$$\lambda([n3^{-k}, (n+1)3^{-k}) \setminus (\max_{t \in \delta_n \cap B} X_n(t) \ge 4\sqrt{3^k} y)) < \epsilon 3^{-k},$$

$$X_n(t) \in L_2, ([0, 1) \cup Z).$$

Obviously, it is enough to take X satisfying

$$X(t) = \phi_0 + \cdots + \phi_{n-1} + X_n(t)$$

for $t \in (\alpha_n, \beta_n]$, $0 \le n < 3^k$. □

Let us reformulate Lemmas 3.10, 3.11 in a more useful way

3.12. Corollary. *A. If $D_1, \ldots, D_L$ have mutually disjoint interiors, $D = \bigcup_l D_l$ and*

$$D_l \in \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon, ||h1_{D_l}||), \quad 1 \le l \le L,$$

for some function $h \in L_2(0, 1]$, then

$$D \in \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon, ||h1_D||).$$

B. If $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{3^k}$ are closed intervals of the same length with mutually disjoint interiors, $D = \bigcup_l \delta_l$ and

$$\delta_l \in \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon, ||a1_{\delta_l}||), \quad 1 \le l \le 3^k,$$

$a \ge 0$, then

$$D \in \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon + e^{-k/144}, ||(a+4k)1_D||).$$

Now we present some properties of information function h_B defined in Section 1. Let us put

$$\delta_n^j = (n3^{-2^j}, (n+1)3^{-2^j}], \quad 0 \le n < 3^{2^j}, \quad j \ge 0. \tag{17}$$

3.13. Definition. We say that a bounded Borel function h on $(0,1]$ is *triadic* if $h \ge 1$ and

$$\delta_n^j \cap (h \ge 2^j) \ne \emptyset$$

implies

$$\delta_n^j \subset (h \ge 2^j),$$

for any $j \ge 0$, $0 \le n < 3^{2^j}$.

Thus obviously

3.14. Lemma. *For any triadic set B, the information function h_B is triadic.*

3.15. Definition. A triadic function h is of type j ($h \in \mathcal{T}_j$ in symbols), if

1^o h is constant on each δ_n^{j+1}, $0 \le n < 3^{2^{j+1}}$;

2^o for each value $h(t) < 2^{j+1}$ we have $h(t) = 2^{j'}$ for some $0 \le j' \le j$.

In particular, for any function $h \in \mathcal{T}_j$ and any $\delta_m^j \subset (h \ge 2^j)$, $0 \le m < 3^{2^j}$, a representation

$$(h - 2^j)1_{\delta_m^j} = \sum_{1 \le k \le K} (2^j + a_k)1_{\delta_{n(k)}^{j+1}} \quad \text{with } a_k \ge 0 \tag{18}$$

is possible, and $\delta_m^j \cap (h \ge 2^{j+1}) = \bigcup_{1 \le k \le K} \delta_{n(k)}^{j+1}$.

Denoting

$$\underline{a} = 2^j \quad \text{for} \quad 2^j \le a < 2^{j+1}, \ j \ge 0, \tag{19}$$

for any $a \ge 1$, we have

3.16. Lemma. *For any triadic set B with information function $h_B \le i+1$, $\underline{h_B}$ is of type i, $\underline{h_B} \in \mathcal{T}_i$.*

3.17. Definition. For any positive sequences $(a_k), (b_k)$, $1 \le k \le K$, we write

$$(b_k) \prec_j (a_k), \quad j \ge 1,$$

if, for some mutually disjoint classes of indices $I_s \subset \{1, \dots, K\}$, $\sharp I_s = 3^{2^{j-1}}$ for $s \in S$, we have

$$b_k \le 2^{j+1} + \min_{l \in I_s} a_l \quad \text{for } k \in I_s,\ s \in S,$$

$$b_k = a_k \quad \text{for} \quad k \notin \bigcup_{s \in S} I_s.$$

3.18 Definition. We say that a (nonlinear) operator U is of type j if U is defined on $\mathcal{T}_j$, and

1^o $Uh \wedge 2^j = h \wedge 2^j$;

2^o for $\delta_m^j \subset (h \ge 2^j)$, we have $\delta_m^j \subset (Uh \ge 2^j)$ and

$$(Uh - 2^j) 1_{\delta_m^j} = \sum_{1 \le k \le K} b_k 1_{\delta_{n(k)}^{j+1}}$$

for some $(b_k) \prec_j (a_k)$, according to representation (18).

3.19. Lemma. *If we have $h \in \mathcal{T}_j$, then $V_j h \in \mathcal{T}_{j-1}$ and $V_j U_j h \in \mathcal{T}_{j-1}$ for any operation U_j of type j.*

The notion of type j operators is useful, because it is natural to describe the complexity of $[0,1]$ for a triadic set B by a norm $||U_8 V_8 \dots U_i V_i h_B - 2^8||$ with U_j of type j (at first). It is done in the following two lemmas. The convention $\mathcal{S}^B(e, y) = \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon, 0) =$ Borel$[0,1]$ for $e \ge 1$ is natural.

3.20. Lemma. *Let*

$$h \wedge 2^{j+1} = \underline{h_B} \wedge 2^{j+1}$$

for some $h \in \mathcal{T}_j$ and some triadic set B. If we have

$$\delta_n^{j+1} \in \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon_j, ||(h - 2^{j+1})^+ 1_{\delta_n^{j+1}}||)$$

for any $0 \le n < 3^{2^{j+1}}$, *then*

$$\delta_m^j \in \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon_j + e^{-2^{j-1}/144}, ||(V_jU_jh - 2^j)^+ 1_{\delta_m^j})||)$$

for $0 \le m < 3^{2^j}$ *and for any operator* U_j *of type* j. *Moreover,*

$$V_jU_jh \in \mathcal{T}_{j-1}, \quad V_jU_jh \wedge 2^j = \underline{h_B} \wedge 2^j. \tag{20}$$

Proof. Fix $\delta_m^j \in (\underline{h_B} \ge 2^j)$. For I_s, $s \in S_m$, defined as in 3.17, 3.18, we have

$$\bigcup_{n\in I_s} \delta_n^{j+1} \in \mathcal{S}(\epsilon_j + e^{-2^{j-1}/144}, ||(m_s + 4\cdot 2^{i-1}) 1_{\bigcup_{n\in I_s} \delta_n^{j+1}}||)$$

with $m_s = \min\{h(t) - 2^{j+1}; t \in \bigcup_{n\in I_s} \delta_n^{i+1}\}$, by 3.12.B.

Thus

$$\bigcup_{n\in I_s} \delta_n^{j+1} \in \mathcal{S}(\epsilon_j + e^{-2^{j-1}/144}, ||(Uh - 2^j)^+ 1_{\bigcup_{n\in I_s^j} \delta_n^{j+1}}||).$$

Then we use 3.12.A, with

$$\{D_1, \dots, D_L\} = \{\bigcup_{n\in I_s} \delta_n^{j+1}; s \in S_m\} \cup \{\delta_n^{j+1}; n \notin \bigcup_{s\in S_m} I_s, \delta_n^{j+1} \subset \delta_m^j\},$$

to obtain

$$\delta_m^j \in \mathcal{S}^B(\epsilon_j + e^{-2^{j-1}/144}, ||(U_jh - 2^j)^+ 1_{\delta_m^j}||).$$

The equality

$$||(U_jh - 2^j)^+ 1_{\delta_m^j}|| = ||(V_jU_jh - 2^j)^+ 1_{\delta_m^j}||$$

and relations (20) are obvious. □

3.21. Lemma. *Let* U_j *be an operator of type* j *for* $8 \le j \le i$, *and let* B *be a triadic set with* $h_B \le 2^{i+1}$. *Then*

$$[0,1] \in \mathcal{S}^B(\frac{1}{2}, ||(V_8U_8 \dots V_iU_i\underline{h_B} - 2^8)^+||).$$

Proof. The assumptions of the previous Lemma, for $j = i$, $h = \underline{h_B}$ and $\epsilon_i = 0$, are obviously satisfied and

$$\delta_m^i \in \mathcal{S}^B(e^{-2^{i-1}/144}, ||(V_iU_i\underline{h_B} - 2^i) 1_{\delta_m^i}||)$$

for any $\delta_m^i \subset (h_B \geq 2^i)$. Then, by backward induction,

$$\delta_m^j \in \mathcal{S}^B(e^{-2^{j-1}/144} + \cdots + e^{-2^{i-1}/144}, ||(V_jU_j \ldots V_iU_i\underline{h_B} - 2^j)^+ 1_{\delta_m^j}||)$$

for any $\delta_m^j \subset (h_B \geq 2^j)$.

It is enough to observe that $e^{-2^{8-1}/144} + \cdots + e^{-2^{i-1}/144} < \frac{1}{2}$, and use once more 3.19.A with

$$\{D_1, \ldots, D_L\} = \{\delta_m^8; 0 \leq m < 2^8, \delta_m^8 \subset (\underline{h_B} \geq 2^8)\}.$$

□

Let us stress that Lemma 3.21 containes the main idea of the proof of implication (16) (and of Lemma 3.3). We only need the implication

(21) $Vh_B \geq Cy, \quad y > 1, \quad$ implies $||V_8U_8 \ldots V_iU_i\underline{h_B} - 2^8)^+|| \geq y$

for suitably chosen $i \geq 1$ and U_j of type j, $8 \leq j \leq i$.

Implication (21) is a consequence of auxliary Lemmas 3.24, 3.25, 3.26, 3.27. Namyly, for same U_j of type j, the operation V_jU_j is j-triadic in the following sense.

3.22. Definition. We say that $W_j : \mathcal{T}_j \to \mathcal{T}_{j-1}$, $j \geq 1$, is a *j-triadic* operation if, for any $h \in \mathcal{T}_j$,

$$W_jh = V_jh - p - q$$

for some positive functions p, q with

$$p + q \leq (V_jh - 2^j)^+,$$

$$p = ||p||_j \leq 2^{-j}, \quad q = ||q||_j \leq 2^{-j}(V_jh - 2^j)^+.$$

Thus in particular $W_jh \wedge 2^j = h \wedge 2^j$ and

$$p + q, 2^jq \leq ||(h - 2^j)^+||_j$$

(cf. Lemma 3.19).

We start with some elementary properties of relation $\prec_i$ defined in 3.14.

3.23. Lemma. *For any positive sequence* (a_k), $1 \le k \le K$, *and for* $i \ge 1$, *there exists a sequence* (b_k) *satisfying* $(b_k) \prec_i (a_k)$ *and*

$$b_k = a_k \quad \textit{or} \quad a_k + 2^i \textit{ for any } 1 \le k \le K,$$

$$a_k + 2^i - b_k = c_k + d_k$$

with some $c_k, d_k \ge 0$,

$$\sum_{1 \le k \le K} c_k^2 \le 3^{2^{i-1}} \cdot 2^{2i} \cdot (2^i + 1),$$

$$d_k \le 2^{-i}(a_k + 2^i), \quad 1 \le k \le K.$$

Proof. Changing notation, if necessary, one can assume that (a_k), $1 \le k \le K$, is an increasing sequence. Denote $L = \max\{k; a_k \le 2^{2i}\}$, $\nu = 3^{2^{i-1}}$ and

$$I_1 = \{1, \dots \nu\}, \dots, I_t = \{(t-1)\nu + 1, \dots t\nu\}$$

with t defined by $t\nu \le L < (t+1)\nu$. Then $\{I_s; s \in S\}$ can be defined by taking the set of indices

$$S = \{s = 1, \dots, t; m_s \ge M_s - 2^i\}$$

with $m_s = \min_{k \in I_s} a_k$, $M_s = \max_{k \in I_s} a_k$.

Take

$$b_k = a_k + 2^i \quad \text{for} \quad k \in \bigcup_{s \in S} I_s,$$

$$b_k = a_k \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

Then inequalities

$$b_k = a_k + 2^i \le M_s + 2^i \le m_s + 2^{i+1}$$

are valid for $k \in I_s$, $s \in S$ and $(b_k) \prec_j (a_k)$ (cf. 3.17). Obviously,

$$2^i \le 2^{-i}(a_k + 2^i)$$

for $a_k \ge 2^{2i}$, in particular for $k > (t+1)\nu$.

Note that, by definition of L, $t+1-\sharp S \le \frac{2^{2i}}{2^i}+1 = 2^i+1$, and

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le k\le (t+1)\nu \\ k\notin \bigcup_{s\in S} I_s}} (2^i)^2 = ((t+1)\nu - \sharp \bigcup_{s\in S} I_s)\cdot 2^{2i} \le 3^{2^{i-1}} 2^{2i}(2^i+1).$$

It is enough to take

$$c_k = 2^i \quad \text{for} \quad 1\le k\le (t+1)\nu,\ k\notin \bigcup_{s\in S} I_s,$$

$$c_k = 0 \ \text{ otherwise;}$$

$$d_k = 2^i \quad \text{for} \quad k > (t+1)\nu$$

$$d_k = 0 \ \text{ otherwise.}$$

□

Now we can pass the first and main step of the proof of implication (21).

3.24. Lemma. *For any $j \ge 5$, there exists an operator U of type j such that $W_j = V_j U$ is j-triadic, according to 3.22.*

Proof. Fix $h_j \in \mathcal{T}_j$. For any $\delta_m^j \subset (h_j \ge 2^j)$ we have a representation (cf. (18)),

$$(h_j - 2^j)^+ 1_{\delta_m^j} = \sum_{1\le k\le K_m} (a_k + 2^j)\delta_{n(m,k)}^{j+1},\ a_k \ge 0.$$

Let

$$(Uh_j - 2^j)^+ 1_{\delta_m^j} = \sum_{1\le k\le K_m} b_k \delta_{n(m,k)}^{j+1}$$

with $b_k = a_k + 2^j - c_k^m - d_k^m$,

$$\sum_{1\le k\le K_m} (c_k^m)^2 \le 3^{2^{j-1}}\cdot 2^{2j}\cdot (2^j+1),$$

$$d_k^m \le 2^{-j}(a_k + 2^j).$$

Thus $(Uh-2^j)^+ = (h-2^j)^+ - f_j - g_j$ (and also $Uh = h - f_j - g_j$)) for

$$f_j = \sum_{0\le m\le 3^{2^j}} \sum_{1\le k\le K_m} c_k^m 1_{\delta_{n(m,k)}^{j+1}}$$

$$g_j = \sum_{0\le m\le 3^{2^j}} \sum_{1\le k\le K_m} d_k^m 1_{\delta_{n(m,k)}^{j+1}}.$$

Obviously,

$$g_j \le 2^{-j}(h_j - 2^j)^+,$$

$$||f_j||_j^2 \le [3^{2^{j-1}} 2^{2j}(2^j+1)] \cdot 3^{-2^{j+1}}/3^{-2^j} \le 2^{-j} \quad \text{on} \quad \delta_m^j$$

if only $j \ge 5$.

Now, $V_j U_j h_j = h_j \wedge 2^j + ||(h_j - 2^j)^+ - f_j - g_j||_j \ge h_j \wedge 2^j + ||(h_j - 2^j)^+||_j - ||f_j||_j - ||g_j||_j$ and we can choose the required functions $p \le ||f_j||_j$, $q_j \le ||g_j||_j$. □

3.25. Lemma. *For any j-triadic operations W_j, $8 \le j \le i$, and any $h \in \mathcal{T}_i$, we have*

$$||W_8 \dots W_i h - 2^8|| \ge (1 - 2^{-7})||V_8 \dots V_i h - 2^8|| - 2^{-7}.$$

Proof. We have

$$W_j \dots W_i h - V_j W_{j+1} \dots W_i h = p_j + q_j,$$

$$p_j = ||p_j||_j \le 2^{-j},$$

$$\begin{aligned} q_j = ||q_j||_j &\le 2^{-j}||(W_{j+1} \dots W_i h - 2^j)^+||_j \\ &\le 2^{-j}||(V_{j+1} \dots V_i h - 2^j)^+||_j = 2^{-j}(V_j \dots V_i h - 2^j)^+ \end{aligned}$$

and, by a backward induction on k,

$$||V_k \dots V_j h_j - V_k \dots V_j (h_j - f)||_k \le ||f||_k$$

for any triadic function h_j, $h_j \wedge 2^j \equiv (h_j - f) \wedge 2^j$.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &||V_k \dots V_{j-1} W_j \dots W_i h - V_k \dots V_j W_{j+1} \dots W_i h||_k \\ &\qquad \le ||p_j||_k + ||g_j||_k \\ &\qquad \le 2^{-j} + 2^{-j}||(V_j \dots V_i h - 2^j)^+||_k \\ &\qquad \le 2^{-j} + 2^{-j}(V_k \dots V_i h - 2^k), \end{aligned}$$

in particular

$$\begin{aligned} &||V_8 \dots V_i h - W_8 \dots W_i h||_8 \\ &\qquad \le (2^{-8} + \dots + 2^{-i}) + (2^{-8} + \dots + 2^{-i})(V_8 \dots V_i h - 2^8). \end{aligned}$$

□

3.26. Lemma. *For any triadic function h on $(0,1]$, $h \le 2^{i+1}$, we have*

$$||(V_8 \dots V_i h - 2^7)^+|| \le 3||(V_8 \dots V_i \underline{h} - 2^7)^+||.$$

Proof. For any interval $\delta_m^i = (m3^{-2^i}, (m+1)3^{-2^i}] \subset (h \ge 2^i)$ we have $V_i\underline{h} \ge 2^i$, $V_i h \le 2^{i+1}$ on δ_m^i, and

$$||(V_i h - 2^{i-1})1_{\delta_m^i}|| \le 3||(V_i \underline{h} - 2^{i-1})1_{\delta_m^i}||.$$

Assume that $\delta_m^j = (m3^{-2^j}, (m+1)3^{-2^j}] \subset (h \ge 2^j)$, and

$$||(V_{j+1} \dots V_i h - 2^j)1_{\delta_n^{j+1}}|| \le 3||(V_{j+1} \dots V_i \underline{h} - 2^j)1_{\delta_n^{j+1}}||$$

for any $\delta_n^{j+1} = (n3^{-2^{j+1}}, (n+1)3^{-2^{j+1}}] \subset \delta_m^j \cap (h \ge 2^{j+1})$, and let I be the set of such indices n. Then

$$\begin{aligned}||(V_j V_{j+1} \dots V_i h - 2^{j-1})1_{\delta_m^j}|| &= ||(2^j - 2^{j-1})1_{\delta_m^j}|| + ||(V_{j+1} \dots V_i h - 2^j)1_{\delta_m^j}|| \\ &\le ||2^j - 2^{j-1}1_{\delta_m^j}|| + ||(2^{j+1} - 2^j)1_{\delta_m^j}|| + (\sum_{n\in I} ||(V_{j+1} \dots V_i h - 2^j)1_{\delta_n^{j+1}}||^2)^{\frac12} \\ \le 3||(2^j - 2^{j-1})1_{\delta_m^j}|| + 3(\sum_{n\in I} ||(V_{j+1} \dots V_i \underline{h} - 2^j)1_{\delta_n}||^2)^{\frac12} &= 3||(V_j \dots V_i \underline{h} - 2^{j-1})1_{\delta_m^j}||.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$||(V_8 \dots V_i h - 2^7)^+ 1_{\delta_m^8}|| \le 3||(V_8 \dots V_i \underline{h} - 2^7)^+ 1_{\delta_m^8}||, \quad 0 \le m < 2^8,$$

which is more then we need. □

3.27. Lemma. *For any triadic function h we have*

$$Vh \le ||(V_8 \dots V_i h - 2^7)^+|| + 2^8.$$

Proof. Obviously

$$||V_0 \dots V_i h|| \le ||h_0|| + \dots + ||h_7|| + ||(V_8 \dots V_i h - 2^8)^+|| \le 2 + (2 + \dots + 2^7) + ||(V_8 \dots V_i h - 2^7||$$

with $h_0 = h \wedge 2^1$, $h_j = h \wedge 2^{j+1} - h \wedge 2^j$, $1 \le j < 8$. □

3.28. Proof of Lemma 3.3. By Lemmas 3.24-3.27, for some U_j of type j, $j \geq 8$, the operations $W_j = V_j U_j$ are j-triadic and

$$\begin{aligned}||V_8U_8 \dots V_iU_i\underline{h_B} - 2^8|| &\geq (1-2^{-7})||V_8 \dots V_i\underline{h_B} - 2^8|| - 2^7 \\ &\geq (1-2^7)(||V_8 \dots V_i\underline{h_B} - 2^7|| - 2^7) - 2^{-7} \\ &\geq (1-2^{-7})\frac{1}{3}||V_8 \dots V_ih_B - 2^7|| - 2^7 + 1 - 2^{-7} \\ &\geq (1-2^{-7})\frac{1}{3}(Vh_B - 2^8) - 2^7 + 1 - 2^{-7}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus the implication (21) is valid with $C = 644$, and Lemma 3.21 can be used. □

4. The construction of a discontinuous process for $Vh_B = \infty$. Up to now we have constructed orthogonal processes on *finite triadic sets* only (Lemma 3.3).

Now we need just one additional geometrical construction (cf. Definition 4.1). It showes in particular, that for any set B satisfying (13) there exists a triadic set $\tilde{B}$ such that $h_{\tilde{B}} \geq h_B$, and the existence of an orthogonal a.e. discontinuous process on B is equivalent to the existence of such a process on $\tilde{B}$.

Let us pass to the details. We start with the crucial

4.1. Definition. Let $A \subset [0,1]$ be a set satisfying

$$\sharp A \cap [\alpha, 1] < \infty \quad \text{for any} \quad \alpha > 0. \tag{22}$$

The set $\tilde{A}$ *generated* by A is defined by the formula

$$\tilde{A} = \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, 1\} \cup \bigcup_{(i,n)\in I} \{n3^{-2^i}, (n+1)3^{-2^i}\},$$

where I is a set of pairs (i,n), $i \geq 1$, $0 \leq n < 3^{2^i}$ for which there exist

$$t \in (n3^{-2^i}, (n+1)3^{-2^i}] \cap A$$

satisfying

$$\rho(t, A \setminus \{t\}) \leq 3^{-2^{i-1}}.$$

The following three lemmas can be obtained by easy and completely elementary considerations.

4.2. Lemma. *Any set $\tilde{A}$ generated, by satisfying (22), A is triadic.*

4.3. Lemma. *For any set $\tilde{B}$ generated, by satisfying (13), B we have $h_{\tilde{B}} \geq h_B$.*

4.4. Lemma. *For A, A_1 satisfying (22) and $A \subset A_1$ we have $\tilde{A} \subset \tilde{A}_1$. If additionally $\sharp A_1 \setminus A < \infty$, then $\sharp \tilde{A}_1 \setminus \tilde{A} < \infty$, in particular $\sharp \tilde{A} < \infty$ for $\sharp A < \infty$.*

Let $\rho(t, B) = \inf_{s \in B} |s - t|$. The following geometrical observation is particularly fruitful.

4.5. Lemma. *For any (finite or countable) set $A \subset [0, 1]$ satisfying (22) and for its generated set $\tilde{A}$ we have*

$$\sum_{t \in \tilde{A}} \rho(t, A) \leq 3, \tag{23}$$

$$\sum_{s \in A} \rho(s, \tilde{A}) \leq 1. \tag{24}$$

Proof. Let $[\alpha, \beta] \cap A = \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Assume that

$$3^{-2^i} \leq \beta - \alpha < 3^{-2^{i-1}}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Then

$$\sharp(\alpha, \beta) \cap \{n3^{-2^j}; 0 \leq j \leq i - 1, 0 \leq n \leq 3^{2^j}\} \leq 1$$

and

$$\sharp(\alpha, \beta) \cap \tilde{A} \cap \{n3^{-2^j}; 0 \leq n \leq 3^{2^j}\} \leq 2$$

for $j \geq i$. Thus

$$\sum_{t \in \tilde{A} \cap [\alpha, \beta]} \rho(t, A) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\beta - \alpha) + 2 \cdot \sum_{j \geq i} 3^{-2^j}$$
$$< (\beta - \alpha)(\frac{1}{2} + 2 \sum_{j \geq i} 3^{-2^j + 2^i}) < 3(\beta - \alpha).$$

For $\beta - \alpha \geq 3^{-1}$ both the relation $\sum_{t \in \tilde{A} \cap [\alpha, \beta]} \rho(t, B) < 3(\beta - \alpha)$ and the inequalities

$$\sum_{t \in \tilde{A} \cap [\beta_0, 1]} \rho(t, A) \leq 3(1 - \beta_0),$$

$$\sum_{t\in\tilde{A}\cap[0,\alpha_0]}\rho(t,A)\le 3\alpha_0$$

for $\alpha_0=\min A$, $\beta_0=\max A$, are obvious. Hence (23).

On the other hand, $[\alpha,\beta]\cap A=\{\alpha,\beta\}$ implies $[\alpha,\beta]\cap\tilde{A}\neq\emptyset$ and

$$\sum_{s\in B\cap[\alpha,\beta]}\rho(s,\tilde{A})\le\beta-\alpha.$$

Moreover,

$$\sum_{s\in B\cap[0,\alpha_0]}\rho(s,\tilde{A})\le\alpha_0,$$

$$\sum_{s\in B\cap[\beta_0,1]}\rho(s,\tilde{A})\le 1-\beta_0,$$

which yields (24). □

Let us remind the X is an orthogonal process on B satisfying (13) if $X:B\to L_2(\mathbb{R})$, $X(0)=0$, $||X(t)-X(s)||=|t-1|$ for $s,t\in B$. Then there obviously exists its extension Y on $B\cup\tilde{B}$, being an orthogonal process on $B\cup\tilde{B}$. Moreover, the a.e. continuity of orthogonal processes on B and their a.e. continuity on $\tilde{B}$ are equivalent. More precisely,

4.6. Lemma. *For any orthogonal process X on $B\cup\tilde{B}$ we have*

$$X_{|B}\quad\textit{is a.e. continuous if and only if}\quad X_{|\tilde{B}}\quad\textit{is a.e. continuous};$$

$$X_{|B}\quad\textit{is a.e. discontinuous if and only if}\quad X_{|\tilde{B}}\quad\textit{is a.e. discontinuous.}$$

Proof. For any function $\Delta:B\to L_2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $\sum_{s\in B}||\Delta(s)||^2<0$, the a.e. continuity of Δ at 0 is obvious.

Let $\phi:B\to\tilde{B}$, $\psi:\tilde{B}\to B$ be any functions satisfying

$$|s-\phi(s)|=\rho(s,\tilde{B})\quad\text{for } s\in B,$$

$$|t-\psi(t)|=\rho(t,B)\quad\text{for } t\in\tilde{B}.$$

Then ϕ,ψ are non-decreasing and it is enough to look at $\Delta(s)=X(s)-X(\phi(s))$ on B and then $\Delta(t)=X(t)-X(\psi(t))$ on $\tilde{B}$, cf. Lemma 4.5. □

As a corollary of Lemma 4.5 we also have

4.7. Lemma. *For any finite set $A \subset [0,1]$, $\alpha = \min A$, if $Vh_{\tilde{A}} \geq C$ for some universal constant $C > 0$, then there exists a process $X : A \to L_2[0,1)$ with*

$$X(\alpha) = 0, \quad ||X(t) - X(s)||^2 = |t - s| \quad \textit{for } s, t \in A,$$

satisfying $\langle X(t), 1_{[0,1)]} \rangle = 0$, $t \in A$, and

$$\lambda(\max_{t \in A} |X(t)| > 1) > \frac{1}{6}.$$

Proof. There exists an orthogonal process $X_1 : \tilde{A} \to L_2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying

$$\lambda([0,1) \cap (\max_{s \in \tilde{A}} X_1(s)^2 > 75)) > \frac{1}{2}$$

if only $C = 5\sqrt{3}c$ with c given by Lemma 3.3. Taking $X = uX_1$ with a suitable unitary operator $u : L_2(\mathbb{R}) \to L_2[0,1)$, we have also

$$\lambda(\max_{s \in \tilde{A}} X(s)^2 > 75) > \frac{1}{3},$$

for some orthogonal process with values in $L_2[0,1)$. One can also assume that X has been extended to an orthogonal process $X : \tilde{A} \cup A \to L_2[0,1)$, and that $\langle X(t), 1_{[0,1)} \rangle = 0$, by standard tricks.

Let, analogously to 4.6, $\rho(s, A) = |s - \phi(s)|$, $s \in \tilde{A}$, $\phi : \tilde{A} \to A$. Schwartz and Tshebyshev's inequalities lead to the following rather obvious estimates. For any $s \in \tilde{A}$,

$$X(s)^2 \leq 3[(X(\phi(s)) - X(\alpha))^2 + (X(\phi(s)) - X(s))^2 + x(\alpha)^2]$$

and

$$\max_{t \in A}(X(t) - X(\alpha))^2 \geq \max_{s \in \tilde{A}}(X(\phi(s)) - X(\alpha))^2 \geq \frac{1}{3} \max_{s \in \tilde{A}} X(s)^2 - Y$$

for

$$Y = X(\alpha)^2 + \sum_{s' \in \tilde{A}} (X(\phi(s')) - X(s'))^2.$$

By Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\int_{[0,1)} Y \leq 4$$

and

$$\lambda(Y \geq 24) < \frac{1}{6}$$

and, by assumptions on $X(s)$, $s \in \tilde{A}$,

$$\lambda(\max_{t\in A}(X(t) - X(\alpha))^2 > 1) > \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{6}.$$

□

From now on let B be a fixed set satisfying (13), with$Vh_B = \infty$.

4.8. Lemma. *For any $\beta \in B$ there exists $0 < \alpha < \beta$, $\alpha \in B$, satisfying $Vh_{B\cap[\alpha,\beta]} \geq C$, with C being a given constant.*

Proof. By Lemmas 4.3, 4.4, $V_{\tilde{B}} = \infty$, $\sharp\tilde{B} \setminus \widetilde{B \cap [0,\beta]} < \infty$ thus $(h_{\tilde{B}} - 2^i)^+ = (h_{\widetilde{B\cap[0,\beta]}} - 2^i)^+$ for some $i \geq 1$ and $Vh_{\widetilde{B\cap[0,\beta]}} = \infty$. In particular

$$||V_0 \dots V_k h_{\widetilde{B\cap[0,\beta]}}|| > C + 1$$

for some $k \geq 1$, and by the Lebesgue monotone convergence theorem (used $k+1$ times), we also have

$$||V_0 \dots V_k h_{\widetilde{B\cap[\alpha,\beta]}}|| > C$$

for sufficiently small $\alpha > 0$.

4.9. The construction of a discontinuous process. Let us recall that B is a fixed set satisfying (13) and $Vh_B = \infty$. By Lemmas 4.7, 4.8, there exist numbers $1 = \alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \dots > 0$ satisfying

$$Vh_{B\cap\widetilde{[\alpha_{s+1},\alpha_s]}} > C, \quad s \geq 1,$$

and

$$\lambda(\max_{t\subset B\cap[\alpha_{s+1},\alpha_s]} |X_s(t)| > 1) > \frac{1}{6}$$

for some processes $X_s : B \cap [\alpha_{s+1}, \alpha_s] \to L_2[0,1)$, $X_s(\alpha_{s+1}) = 0$, $||X_s(t) - X_s(t_1)||^2 = |t - t_1|$, $\langle X(t), 1_{[0,1)}\rangle = 0$. Taking the space $([0,1)^{\mathbb{N}}, \lambda^{\otimes\mathbb{N}})$, isomorphic to $([0,1),\lambda)$, and denoting

$$\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots) \quad \text{for } \omega \in [0,1)^{\mathbb{N}},$$

it is enough put

$$X(t)(\omega) = X_s(t)(\omega_s) + \sum_{s'>s} X_{s'}(\alpha_{s'})(\omega_{s'})$$

for $t \in (\alpha_{s+1}, \alpha_s]$. By Borel-Cantelli Lemma, the Cauchy condition for $X(t)$, $t \to 0$, $t \in B$, fails on a set Z of measure $\lambda^{\otimes\mathbb{N}}(Z) = 1$. The existence of an a.e. discontinues process with values in $L_2[0,1)$ is equivalent to the existence of such a process with values in $L_2(\mathbb{R})$.

5. The proof of continuity of any process for $Vh_B < \infty$. Assume now that $Vh_B < \infty$ for some set B satisfying (13). We show that any orthogonal process X on B is a.e. continuous. By Lemmas 4.2, 4.6, it is enough to show that each such process on $\tilde{B}$ is continuous a.e. for the triadic generated set $\tilde{B}$. Thus the proof of the continuity of an orthogonal process X on B splits into two main parts.

First we show that each such process is a.e. continuous if B is a *triadic* set with $Vh_B < \infty$ (cf. Lemma 5.7). The proof is pretty simple and based on classical ideas (due to Plancherel and Tandori).

More tedious estimates for information functions are needed in the second part, when we show that $Vh_B < \infty$ implies $Vh_{\tilde{B}} < \infty$ for any set B satisfying (13) and its generated set $\tilde{B}$ (Lemmas 5.10, 5.12).

In the first part a crucial role is played by the classical Plancherel idea of diadic partitions of a given sequence of vectors. It gives (see [2])

5.1. Lemma. *For any othogonal vectors $Y_1, \dots Y_N$ in L_2, we have*

$$||M||^2 \le k^2 \sum_{1\le n\le N} ||X||^2$$

for

$$M = \max_{1\le n\le N} |Y_1 + \dots + Y_N|,$$

$$k \ge \log_2 N + 1.$$

In particular, if an orthogonal process X is defined on the whole set

$$A_m^j = \{n3^{-2^{j+1}}; 0 \le n < 3^{2^{j+1}}\} \cap \delta_m^j \tag{25}$$

for a fixed $j \geq 0$, $0 \leq m < 3^{2^j}$, then

$$|| \max_{t \in A_m^j} |X(t) - X(m3^{-2^j})| \, || \leq 3 \cdot 2^j \sqrt{\lambda(\delta_m^j)}. \tag{26}$$

Let us fix a finite triadic set B and an orthogonal process X on B.

5.2. Notation. For any $j \geq 1$, $0 \leq m < 3^{2^j}$, denote

$$M_m^j = \max_{t \in \delta_n^j \cap B} |X(t) - X(n3^{-2^j})|$$

if $(n3^{-2^j}, (n+1)3^{-2^j}) \cap B \neq \emptyset$, and $M_m^j = 0$ otherwise.

5.3. Notation. For any triadic function h we put

$$\bar{V}_j h = (h \wedge 2^j) + 2^j 1_{(h \geq 2^j)} + ||(h - 2^{j+1})^+||_j,$$

which is obviously another triadic function.

The operations $\bar{V}_j$ are now useful because of the following crucial estimate.

5.4. Lemma. *Assume that for some triadic function h and for $j \geq 0$ we have $h \wedge 2^{j+1} = h_B \wedge 2^{j+1}$ and, for M_n^{j+1} defined in 5.2,*

$$||M_n^{j+1}|| \leq 3||(h - 2^{j+1})^+ 1_{\delta_n^{j+1}}||$$

for any $0 \leq n < 3^{2^{j+1}}$. Then

$$||M_m^j|| \leq 3||(\bar{V}_j h - 2^j)^+ 1_{\delta_m^j}||$$

for $0 \leq m < 3^{2^j}$, and obviously $\bar{V}_j h \wedge 2^j = h_B \wedge 2^j$.

Proof. Let us fix δ_m^j such that $\operatorname{Int} \delta_m^j \cap B \neq \emptyset$. To unify our considerations, let us assume that X is extended is such a way that $A_m^j \subset B$ for the set given by (25). Using (26), we get

$$||M_m^j|| \leq || \max_{t \in A_m^j} |X(t) - X(m3^{-2^j})| \, || + || \max_{\substack{0 \leq n < 3^{2^{j+1}} \\ \delta_n^{j+1} \subset \delta_m^j}} M_n^{j+1}||,$$

$$|| \max_{t \in A_m^j} |X(t) - X(m3^{-2^j})| \, || \leq 3||2^j 1_{\delta_m^j}||,$$

$$||\max_{\substack{0\le n<3^{2^{j+1}}\\ \delta_n^{j+1}\subset\delta_m^j}} M_n^{j+1}||^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{\substack{0\le n<3^{2^{j+1}}\\ \delta_n^{j+1}\subset\delta_m^j}} (M_n^{j+1})^2$$

$$\le 9 \sum_{\substack{0\le n<3^{2^{j+1}}\\ \delta_n^{j+1}\subset\delta_m^j}} ||(h-2^{j+1})^+ 1_{\delta_n^{j+1}}||^2 = 9||(h-2^{j+1})^+ 1_{\delta_m^j}||^2.$$

By the definition of conditional norm, the equality

$$||2^j 1_{\delta_m^j}|| + ||(h-2^{j+1})^+ 1_{\delta_m^j}|| = ||(\bar{V}h - 2^j)^+ 1_{\delta_m^j}||$$

is obvious; in fact, in the case Int $\delta_m^j \cap B \neq \emptyset$ we have $\delta_m^j \subset (h_B \ge 2^j) = (h \ge 2^j)$.

In the oposite case there is nothing to prove. □

By an obvious backward induction we have

5.5. Corollary. *If a finite triadic set B satisfies $h_B \le 2^{i+1}$, $i \ge 0$, then*

$$||M_n^j|| \le 3||(\bar{V}_j \dots \bar{V}_i h_B - 2^j)^+ 1_{\delta_n^j}||$$

for $0 \le j \le i$, $0 \le n < 3^{2^j}$, for any orthogonal process X on B and for M_n^j given by 5.2.

In fact we can use operations V_j instead of $\bar{V}_j$ because of the following trick.

5.6. Lemma. *For any triadic function h satisfying $h \le 2^{i+1}$, we have*

$$(\bar{V}_j \dots \bar{V}_i h - 2^j)^+ \le (2V_j \dots V_i h - 2^j)^+, \quad 0 \le j < i.$$

Proof. We leave to the reader the fairly straightforward backward induction showing that

$$(\bar{V}_j \dots \bar{V}_i h - 2^j)^+ = (2V_j \dots V_i \frac{1}{2}\bar{h} - 2^j)^+$$

with $\bar{h} = 2^{j+1}$ for $2^j \le h < 2^{j+1}$, $0 \le j < i$, $\bar{h} = 2^{i+1}$ for $2^i \le h \le 2^{i+1}$. Obviously $\frac{1}{2}\bar{h} \le h$. □

The continuity of orthogonal processes on *any* triadic set (the goal of the first part of this section) can be obtained now by a simple formal reasoning.

5.7. Lemma. *For any triadic set B with $Vh_B < \infty$, any orthogonal process $X(t)$, $t \in B$, is continuous.*

Proof. We have

$$|| \lim_{i\to\infty} V_j \dots V_i h_B 1_{\delta_0^j}|| \to 0 \quad \text{for} \quad j \to \infty.$$

Thus, for suitably chosen $j(1) < j(2) < \dots$, we have, in particular,

$$\sum_{s\geq 1} || \lim_{i\to\infty} (2V_{j(s)} \dots V_i h_B - 2^{j(s)})^+|| < \infty. \tag{27}$$

For suitably chosen $i(s) > j(s)$, $s \geq 1$, denoting $B_s = \{n3^{-2^{i(s)+1}}; 0 \leq n \leq 3^{2^{i(s)+1}}\}$, we have

$$B \setminus \delta_0^{j(s+1)} \in B_s \quad \text{(cf. Definition 3.1)},$$

and

$$M(s) := \max_{t\in B\cap(\delta_0^{j(s)}\setminus\delta_0^{j(s+1)})} |X(t)| \leq M_0^{j(s)}$$

for $M_0^{j(s)}$ given in Definition 5.2 in which, instead of X, we take the process $X_{|B\cap B_s}$ restricted to a finite triadic set $B \cap B_s$. Obviously, $h_{B\cap B_s} \leq 2^{i(s)+1}$ and, using Lemma 5.6 and Corollary 5.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} ||M(s)|| \leq ||M_0^{j(s)}|| &\leq 3||(2V_{j(s)} \dots V_{i(s)} h_{B\cap B_s} - 2^{j(s)})^+|| \\ &= 3|| \lim_{i\to\infty} (2V_{j(s)} \dots V_i h_{B\cap B_s} - 2^{j(s)})^+|| \\ &\leq 3|| \lim_{i\to\infty} (2V_{j(s)} \dots V_i h_B - 2^{j(s)})^+||. \end{aligned}$$

By (27), this finishes the proof. □

Let $\tilde{B}$ be a triadic set generated by the given set B satisfying (13). Thus $\tilde{B}$ can be used in Lemma 5.7. By Lemma 4.6, continuity of orthogonal processes on B and on $\tilde{B}$ are equivalent. Thus it is enough to show that the inequality $Vh_{\tilde{B}} < \infty$ is implied by $Vh_B < \infty$. It can be done in a number of elementary ways. Precise calculations are fairly tedious.

5.8. Lemma. *Let $Vg = g \wedge 4 + ||(g-4)^+||$ act in a real L_2-space for a probability measure P. Let moreover $g \geq g_1 \geq 2$ and, for $A = (g \geq 8)$,*

$$||(g-2)1_A|| \leq 14||(g_1-2)1_A||, \quad g_1 \geq 4 \text{ on } A, \tag{28}$$

for some given elements $g, g_1 \in L_2$. Then

$$||Vg - 1|| \leq 14||Vg_1 - 1||$$

and, obviously,

$$Vg \geq Vg_1 \geq 2.$$

Proof. Put $x = ||(g_1-4)1_A||$, $\Delta = P(A)$, $\Delta' = P(A^c)$. Then, by (28),

$$\begin{aligned} ||Vg - 1|| &\leq 3 + ||(g-4)^+|| \leq 3 + 4 + ||(g-8)1_A|| \\ &\leq 7 + 14||(g_1-2)1_A|| \\ &\leq 7 + 14(x + 2\sqrt{\Delta}) = 14(x + 2\sqrt{\Delta} + \frac{1}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand $||(g_1-4)^+|| \geq x$, $Vg_1 \geq (4+x)1_A + (2+x)1_{A^c}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &||Vg_1 - 1|| \geq \sqrt{(x+3)^2\Delta + (x+1)^2\Delta'} \\ &= ((x+2\sqrt{\Delta}+\frac{1}{2})^2 + (\sqrt{x}-2\sqrt{x\Delta})^2 + (\frac{1}{2}-2\sqrt{\Delta})^2 + \frac{1}{2} + 4x\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq x + 2\sqrt{\Delta} + \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

5.9. Notation. For any number $a \geq 1$ we write

$$\underset{=}{a} = 2^{j-1} \quad \text{for } 2^j \leq a < 2^{j+1},\ j \geq 0.$$

5.10. Lemma. *For any triadic function h satisfying $h \leq 2^{i+1}$ we have*

$$||V_0 \dots V_i h|| \leq 14||V_0 \dots V_i \underset{=}{h}||.$$

Proof. We show that $||(V_j \dots V_i h - 2^{j-2})1_{\delta_m^j}|| \leq 14||(V_j \dots V_i \underset{=}{h} - 2^{j-2})1_{\delta_m^j}||$ by backward induction on j, $0 \leq j \leq i$. For any interval $\delta_n^i = (n3^{-2^i}, (n+1)3^{-2^i}] \subset (h \geq 2^i)$, we have

$$\underset{=}{h} \geq 2^{i-1} \quad \text{on} \quad \delta_n^i, \tag{29}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
||(V_i h - 2^{i-2})1_{\delta_n^i}|| \leq & 7||2^{i-2}1_{\delta_n^i}|| \\
\leq & 7||(V_i \underline{\underline{h}} - 2^{i-2})1_{\delta_n^i}|| \\
\leq & 14||V_i \underline{\underline{h}} - 2^{i-2})1_{\delta_n^i}||.
\end{aligned} \tag{30}
$$

Let us fix j, $0 \leq j < i$ and suppose that

$$V_{j+1} \dots V_i \underline{\underline{h}} \geq 2^j$$

on any interval $\delta_n^{i+1} \subset (V_{j+1} \dots V_i h \geq 2^{j+1})$, and that

$$||(V_{j+1} \dots V_i h - 2^{j-1})1_{\delta_n^{j+1}}|| \leq 14||(V_{j+1} \dots V_i \underline{\underline{h}} - 2^{j-1})1_{\delta_n^{j+1}}||$$

(thus we assume (29), (30) with $j+1$, $V_{j+1} \dots V_i h$, $V_{j+1} \dots V_i \underline{\underline{h}}$ instead of $i, h, \underline{\underline{h}}$).

By the definition of a triadic function, for

$$\delta_m^j \subset (h \geq 2^j), \quad A = \delta_m^j \cap (h \geq 2^{j+1}),$$

we have

$$A = \bigcup_{1 \leq k \leq K} \delta_{n(k)}^{j+1}$$

for some $0 \leq n(k) < 3^{2^{j+1}}$. Thus all assumptions of Lemma 5.8 are satisfied for $L_2 = L_2(\delta_m^j)$, with the normalized Lebesgue measure,

$$g = 2^{-j+2} V_{j+1} \dots V_i h \quad \text{on} \quad \delta_m^j,$$

$$g_1 = 2^{-j+2} V_{j+1} \dots V_i \underline{\underline{h}} \quad \text{on} \quad \delta_m^j.$$

Thus

$$V_j \dots V_i \underline{\underline{h}} \geq 2^{j-1} \quad \text{on} \quad \delta_m^j,$$

$$||(V_j \dots V_i h - 2^{j-2})1_{\delta_m^j}|| \leq 14||(V_j \dots V_i \underline{\underline{h}} - 2^{j-2})1_{\delta_m^j}||.$$

By backward induction the last inequality is valid for any $0 \leq j \leq i$. Taking $j = 0$ we obtain more then needed. □

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is now reduced to the implication $Vh_B < \infty \implies V\underline{\underline{h}}_{\tilde{B}} < \infty$. Unexpectedly, for arguments h_B, $\underline{\underline{h}}_{\tilde{B}}$, being not necessarily triadic

functions, the comparison of values $V_i h_B$, $V_i h_{\underline{\underline{\tilde{B}}}}$ of our crucial operation V_i is complicated. To compress the calculations, we use the following notation (cf. 1.4).

5.11. Notation. For any function $f \geq 1$, we write

$$f_{j\downarrow} = f \wedge 2^j$$

and

$$f_j = f_{j+1\downarrow} - f_{j\downarrow}, \quad f_{j\uparrow} = f - f_{j\downarrow},$$

for $j \geq 0$, in particular

$$f = f_{j\downarrow} + f_j + f_{j+1\uparrow}$$

for any real function f.

5.12. Lemma. *For any Borel functions $1 \leq g \leq h$ on $(0,1]$ and for*

$$A = \bigcup_{\substack{0 \leq n < 3^{2^j} \\ \delta_n^j \cap (h \geq 2^j) \neq \emptyset}} \delta_n^j \tag{31}$$

with $j \geq 1$, we have

$$||(V_j h)_{j-1\uparrow} - (V_j g)_{j-1\uparrow}|| \leq ||h_{j\uparrow} - g_{j\uparrow}|| + ||(h_{j\downarrow} - g_{j\downarrow})1_A|| + ||h_{j-1} - g_{j-1}||.$$

Proof. The required calculations are natural:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(V_j h)_{j-1\uparrow} - (V_j g)_{j-1\uparrow} \\
&\qquad = (h_{j-1} - g_{j-1})1_A c + ((V_j h)_{j-1\uparrow} - (V_j g)_{j-1\uparrow})1_A \\
&\qquad \leq (h_{j-1} - g_{j-1})1_A c + (V_j h - V_j g)1_A \\
&\qquad \leq (h_{j-1} - g_{j-1})1_A c + ||h_{j\uparrow} - g_{j\uparrow}||_j + (h_{j\downarrow} - g_{j\downarrow})1_A \\
&\qquad \leq (h_{j-1} - g_{j-1}) + ||h_{j\uparrow} - g_{j\uparrow}||_j + (h_{j\downarrow} - g_{j\downarrow})1_A.
\end{aligned}$$

5.13. Lemma. *For any set B satisfying (13) and for $0 \leq j < i$ let us put*

$$g = V_{j+1} \dots V_i h_B,$$

$$h = V_{j+1} \dots V_i (h_B \vee h_{\underline{\underline{\tilde{B}}}})$$

and let the set A be given by (31). Then

$$||h_{j-1} - g_{j-1}|| \leq 2^j \cdot 3^{-2^{j-1}}, \tag{32}$$

$$||(h_{j\downarrow} - g_{j\downarrow})1_A|| \leq 2^{j+1}3^{-2^{j-2}}. \tag{33}$$

Proof. The inequality (32) is an immediate consequence of our Definition 4.1. Let us fix an interval $(\alpha, \beta]$ satisfying $[\alpha, \beta] \cap B = \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Observe that, by 5.9,

$$(\alpha, \beta] \cap (\underset{=}{h_{\tilde{B}}} > 2^{j-1}) = (\alpha, \beta] \cap (h_{\tilde{B}} > 2^{j+1}) \subset \delta_k^{j+1} \cup \delta_l^{j+1}$$

for some $0 \leq k \leq l < 3^{2^{j+1}}$, and, because of the structure of $V_{j+1}, \ldots, V_i$,

$$(\alpha, \beta] \cap (h > 2^{j-1}) \subset \delta_k^{j+1} \cup \delta_l^{j+1}.$$

Thus $\lambda((\alpha, \beta] \cap [h > 2^{j-1})) < 2 \cdot 3^{-2^{j+1}}$.

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} \sharp\{(\alpha, \beta]; \quad & [\alpha, \beta] \cap B = \{\alpha, \beta\}, (g < 2^j) \cap (\alpha, \beta] \neq \emptyset\} \\ & \leq \sharp\{((\alpha, \beta]; \quad [\alpha, \beta] \cap B = \{\alpha, \beta\}, (h_B < 2^j) \cap (\alpha, \beta] \neq \emptyset\} \leq 1/3^{-2^j}, \end{aligned}$$

as $(h_B)_{j+1\downarrow} \leq g_{j+1\downarrow}$. Inequality (32) is given by a natural estimate

$$||h_{j-1} - g_{j-1}|| \leq 2^{j-1}[\bigcup_{\substack{(\alpha,\beta] \\ [\alpha,\beta]\cap B=\{\alpha,\beta\}}} \lambda((\alpha, \beta] \cap (g < 2^j) \cap (h > 2^{j-1}))]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

To prove (33) let us fix $\delta_m^j \subset A$, $0 \leq m < 3^{2^j}$. Supposing $\delta_m^j \cap B = \emptyset$, we have $\delta_m^j \cap \tilde{B} = \emptyset$ and $\delta_m^j \subset A^c$. A careful analysis is needed only when

$$k = \min\{n; \delta_n^{j+1} \cap \delta_m^j \cap B \neq \emptyset\},$$

$$l = \max\{n; \delta_n^{j+1} \cap \delta_m^j \cap B \neq \emptyset\}$$

are defined. The case $k = l$ is obviously possible. Then

$$h_B > 2^j \quad \text{on} \bigcup_{k<n<l} \delta_n^{j+1}$$

and, by the structure of $V_{j+1}, \dots, V_i$,

$$h \geq g > 2^j \quad \text{on} \bigcup_{k<n<l} \delta_n^{j+1}.$$

Moreover

$$(B \cup \tilde{B}) \cap \delta_m^j \cap \bigcup_{n<k \text{ or } n>l} \delta_n^{j+1} = \emptyset$$

and h_B, $h_{\tilde{B}}$ are constant on the set $\delta_m^j \cap \bigcup_{n<k} \delta_n^{j+1}$ as well as on the set $\delta_m^j \cap \bigcup_{n>l} \delta_n^{j+1}$. It can be easily verified that

$$\underset{=}{h}_{\tilde{B}_1} \leq 2^{j-1} \quad \text{on } \delta_m^j \cap \bigcup_{n<k \text{ or } n>l} \delta_n^{j+1},$$

and obviously $g = h_B$, $h = h_B \vee \underset{=}{h}_{\tilde{B}_1}$, on $\delta_m^j \cap \bigcup_{n<k \text{ or } n>l} \delta_n^{j+1}$. We say that m is *special* if

$$(g < 2^{j-2}) \cap \delta_m^j \cap \bigcup_{n<k \text{ or } n>l} \delta_n^{j+1} \neq \emptyset.$$

Then, by natural estimation of the number of "large" intervals $(\alpha, \beta]$ defined by $[\alpha, \beta] \cap B = \{\alpha, \beta\}$, $\beta - \alpha > 3^{-2^{j-1}}$, we have

$$\sharp\{0 \leq m < 3^{2^j}; m \text{ is special}\} \leq 2\sharp \text{ (set of "large" intervals } (\alpha, \beta]),$$

and

$$||h_{j\downarrow} - g_{j\downarrow}||^2 \leq 2^{2j} \cdot 3^{-2^{j+1}} \cdot 2 \cdot \sharp\{0, \dots, 3^{2^j} - 1\}$$
$$+ 2^{2j} \cdot 3^{-2^j} \cdot \sharp\{0 \leq m < 3^{2^j}; m \text{ is special}\} \leq 2 \cdot 2^{2j}(3^{-2^j} + 3^{-2^j} \cdot 3^{2^{j-1}}).$$

Hence (33). □

5.13. Proof of Theorem 1.2. For any set B satisfying (13) with $h_B \leq K < \infty$ we have $Vh_{B_1} \leq K$ for any finite subset $B_1 \subset B$, satisfying (13). Obviously $h_{B_1}, \underset{=}{h}_{\tilde{B}_1} \leq 2^i$ for suitably large $i \geq 1$, and Lemmas 5.11, 5.12 give inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} ||V_0 \dots V_i \underset{=}{h}_{\tilde{B}_1} - 1|| &\leq ||V_0 \dots V_i (\underset{=}{h}_{\tilde{B}_1} \vee h_{B_1}) - 1|| \\ &\leq ||V_0 \dots V_i h_{B_1} - 1|| + \sum_{j \geq 0} (2^j \cdot 3^{-2^{j-1}} + 2^{j+1} \cdot 3^{-2^{j-2}}) \\ &\leq K + \sum_{j \geq 0} (2^j \cdot 3^{-2^j} + 2^{j+1} \cdot 3^{-2^{j-2}}) =: L, \end{aligned}$$

and, by Lemma 5.10,

$$||V_0 \dots V_i h_{\tilde{B}_1}|| \leq 14(L+1).$$

Then $Vh_{\tilde{B}} < 14(L+1)$ by an obvious application of the Lebesgue monotone convergence theorem, and Lemmas 5.7, 4.6 give a.e. convergence of any orthogonal process on B.

Together with 4.9, it completes the proof of 1.2.

6. Applications to the continuity of orthogonal processes

The definition of an orthogonal process X on B can be used for any set B, $\{0,1\} \subset B \subset [0,1]$. Taking $X(t) = \lim_{n\to\infty} X(t_n)$ in L_2, with some $t_n \to t$, $t_n \in B$, for any $t \in \bar{B}$, one can extend X to an orthogonal process defined on the closure $\bar{B}$ of B.

It is natural to assume in what follows that the set of time moments B is closed and $\{0,1\} \subset B \subset [0,1]$. In such a general case it is natural to accept infinite values of information function of the 'partition' given by B. Thus, we define

$$\begin{aligned} &H_B(t) = \infty \quad \text{for} \quad t \in B, \\ &H_B(t) = -\log_3(\beta - \alpha) \quad \text{for} \quad t \in (\alpha,\beta), [\alpha,\beta] \cap B = \{\alpha,\beta\}. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Obviously, $H_B = h_B$ a.e., if only B satisfies (13).

As usually, $\tilde{X}$ is a *version* of the process X if $\tilde{X}(t)$ represents an element $X(t) \in L_2$ and $\tilde{X}(t)$ is a function, for any $t \in B$. Allowing possibly uncountable sets B, we use the following definition:

$X : B \to L_2$ is a.e. continuous at $t \in B$ if there exists a version of X a.e. continuous at t.

$X : B \to L_2$ is a.e. discontinuous at a point $t \in B$ if any version of X is a.e. discontinuous at t.

As a rather easy and formal corollary we obtain now the main result of this section.

6.1. Theorem. *For any $t \in B = \bar{B}$, $\{0,1\} \subset B \subset [0,1]$:*

A. *Any orthogonal process on B is a.e. continues at t if and only if $V(H_B 1_U) < \infty$ for some neighbourhood U of t.*

B. *There exists an orthogonal process on B a.e. discontinues at t if and only if $V(H_B 1_U) = \infty$ for any neighbourhood U of t.*

6.2. Definition. Let us say that a Lebesgue measure preserving, one to one mapping $S^j : (0,1] \to (0,1]$ is of j-type, $j \geq -1$, if S^j restricted to any δ_n^{j+1} is a shift by a multiple of $3^{-2^{j+1}}$, i.e.

$$S^j(t) = t + k \cdot 3^{-2^{j+1}} \quad \text{for} \quad t \in \delta_n^{j+1}$$

with an integer k, depending on $0 \leq n < 3^{2^{j+1}}$.

Moreover, we say that some j-type mapping S_m^j, $j \geq 0$, is of j,m-type, $0 \leq m < 3^{2^j}$, if S_m^j is the identity on $(0,1] \setminus \delta_m^j$. Finally, for $t \in [0,1] \setminus \{n3^{-2^j}; j \geq 0, 0 \leq n \leq 3^{2^j}\}$, the mapping $S_t : [0,1] \to (0,1]$ is a t-operation if

$$S_t = \lim_{i \to \infty} S^{-1} S^0_{m_0} \circ \cdots \circ S^i_{m_i}$$

for some mapping S^{-1} of (-1)-type and mappings $S^j_{m_j}$ being of j, m_j-types, respectively, with m_j satisfying $\delta^0_{m_0} \supset \delta^1_{m_1} \supset \ldots, \bigcap_{j \geq 0} \delta^j_{m_j} = \{t\}$.

As $\sum_{j \geq 0} \sup_{t \in (0,1]} |S^j_{m_j} t - t| \leq \sum_{j \geq 0} 3^{-2^j} < \infty$, the limit S_t is a well defined Lebesgue measure preserving mapping, one to one on $(0,1] \setminus \{t\}$.

6.3. Lemma. *For any set $B = \bar{B}$, $\{0,1\} \subset B \subset [0,1]$ and t-operation S we have $VH_B = VH_{\overline{S(B)}}$.*

Proof. Note that $||V_0 \ldots V_i H_{\bar{B}_1}|| = ||V_0 \ldots V_i H_{\overline{S^j_m B_1}}||$ for any $\{0,1\} \subset B_1 \subset [0,1]$ and S^j_m being of j,m-type. Thus, by the monotonic passage to the limits,

$$||V_0 \ldots V_i H_B|| = ||V_0 \ldots V_i H_{\overline{S^{-1} S^0_{m_0} \ldots S^i_{m_i}(B)}}||,$$

$$||V_0 \ldots V_i H_B|| = ||V_0 \ldots V_i H_{\overline{S(B)}}||,$$

$$VH_B = VH_{\overline{S(B)}}.$$

6.4. Lemma. *For any $t \in (0,1] \setminus \{n3^{-2^j}; j \geq 0, 0 \leq n \leq 3^{2^j}\}$ there exist $m_j, j \geq 0$, and $S^j_{m_j}$ of j, m_j-type, $j \geq 0$, and S^{-1} of (-1)-type such that $S_t(t) = 0$ for the t-operation S given by Definition 6.2, and S_t is continuous at t.*

Proof. Define m_j by the condition $t \in \delta^j_{m_j}$, $j \geq 0$, and put

$$S^j_{m_j}(\delta^{j+1}_{n_1}) = \delta^{j+1}_{n_3},$$

$$S^j_{m_j}(\delta^{j+1}_{n_3}) = \delta^{j+1}_{n_1}$$

for n_1, n_2, n_3 defined by

$$\delta^j_{m_j} = \bigcup_{n_1 \leq n \leq n_2} \delta^{j+1}_n, \quad t \in \delta^{j+1}_{n_3}.$$

S^{-1} can be defined by a similar trick. □

By Lemmas 6.3, 6.4, the investigation of continuity of an orthogonal process in any point t can be reduced to the case $t = 0$.

6.5. Lemma. *Let S_t be defined as in 6.2 for some $t \in [0,1] \setminus \{n3^{-2^j}; j \geq 0, 0 \leq n \leq 3^{2^j}\}$, and let $S_t(0) = 0$.*

A. *Any orthogonal process on B is a.e. continuous at t if and only if each orthogonal process on $S_t(B)$ is continuous at* 0.

B. *There exists an orthogonal process on B a.e. discontinuous at t if and only if there exists an orthogonal process on $S(B)$ a.e. discontinuous at* 0.

Proof. Observe that for any orthogonal process X on B and any mapping S^j_m of j,m-type, one can put

$$Y(S^j_m(s)) = X(s) + R(s), \quad s \in B,$$

being an orthogonal process on $S^j_m(B)$ for some $R : (0,1] \to L_2(\mathbb{R})$,

$$R \text{ being constant on each } \delta^{j+1}_n,$$

$$||R(t)||^2 \leq 3^{-2^j} \quad \text{for any } t \in (0,1].$$

Consequently, for any process X orthogonal on B there exists a process $R : (0,1] \to L_2(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$Y(S_t(s)) = X(s) + R(s), \quad s \in B,$$

is orthogonal on $S_t(B)$ and

$$R \text{ is a.e. continuous at } t.$$

Similarly, for any process Y orthogonal on $S_t(B)$ there exists a process $P : [0,1] \to L_2(\mathbb{R})$ for which

$$X(s) = Y(S_t(s)) + P(S_t(s)), \quad s \in B,$$

is orthogonal on B and

$$P \text{ is a.e. continuous in } 0.$$

The construction of the processes R and P gives both equivalences A and B.

6.6. Lemma. A. *Any orthogonal process on B has a version a.e. continuous at $t = 0$ if and only if $V(H_B 1_{[0,\frac{1}{k}]}) < \infty$ for some $k \geq 1$.*

B. *There exists an orthogonal process on B with all versions a.e. discontinuous at $t = 0$ if and only if $V(H_B 1_{[0,\frac{1}{k}]}) = \infty$ for any $k \geq 1$.*

Proof. Assume that each version of an orthogonal process X on B is not a.e. continuous at $t = 0$. Let us fix a countable dense subset B_1 in B, $0 \in B_1$. An assumposition that the restriction $X_{|B_1}$ is a.e. continuous at $t = 0$ leads to the existence of a version $\tilde{X}$ of X, a.e. continuous at $t = 0$ and defined on the whole of B. Thus, for some $\epsilon > 0$,

$$|| \sup_{t \in B_1 \cap [0,\frac{1}{k}]} |X(t)|| \geq \epsilon$$

for any $k \geq 1$, and

$$|| \sup_{t \in B_{1,k}} |X(t)| \, || \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

for some finite sets $B_{1,k} \subset B_1 \cap [0, \frac{1}{k}]$, and $X_{|B_2}$ is not a.e. continuous at $t = 0$ for a countable set

$$B_2 = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} B_{1,k} \cup \{0, 1\}$$

satisfying (13). Theorem 1.7. implies then inequality $VH_B \geq VH_{B_2} = Vh_{B_2} = \infty$.

Assume now that $V(H_B 1_{[0,\frac{1}{k}]}) = \infty$ for any $k \geq 1$. Let B^{ir} be a set of 'irregular' points of B:

$$t \in B^{ir} \iff t \in B \wedge (t \notin \overline{B \cap (t,\infty)} \vee t \notin \overline{B \cap (-\infty,t)}).$$

Then $\lambda(B^{ir}) = 0$ and $V(H_B 1_{(0,1]\setminus B^{ir}}) = \infty$. Let us observe that for

$$\{0,1\} \subset B_1 \subset B_2 \subset \cdots \subset B \setminus B^{ir}, \quad \sharp B_l < \infty,$$

with $\bigcup_{l\geq 1} B_l$ being a dense (countable) subset of $B \setminus B^{ir}$, we have

$$h_{B_l} \nearrow H_B \quad \text{on } (0,1] \setminus B^{ir}.$$

In particular, $\lim_{l\to\infty} V(h_{B_l} 1_{[0,k]}) = \infty$ for any k and the existence of a subset $\mathcal{B}^s \subset B$ satisfying (13), with $Vh_{B^s} = \infty$ is pretty obvious. By Theorem 1.7, there exists an a.e. discontinuous at 0 process X_1 on B^s. Any extension of $\tilde{X}_1$ to an orthogonal process X on B has then the property that any version of X is a.e. discontinues at $t = 0$.

6.7. Proof of Theorem 6.2. Take first $t \in [0,1] \setminus \{n3^{-2^j}; j \geq 0, 0 \leq n \leq 3^{2^j}\}$. Then Lemmas 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 reduce the problem to Lemma 6.6.

Assume now that $t = n3^{-2^j}$ for some $j \geq 0$, $0 \leq n \leq 3^{2^j}$. For any process X orthogonal on B, the process $X(1-t) - X(1)$ is obviously orthogonal on $1 - B = \{1 - t; t \in B\}$. Thus Lemma 6.6 can be proved, equally well, in the following version.

A'. Any orthogonal process on B is a.e. continuous at $t = 1$ if and only if $V(H_B 1_{[\frac{k-1}{k},1]}) < \infty$ for some $k \geq 1$.

B'. There exists an orthogonal process on B a.e. discontinuous at $t = 1$ if and only if $V(H_B 1_{[\frac{k-1}{k},1]}) = \infty$ for any $k \geq 1$.

We can assume now that $t = n3^{-2^j}$, $0 < n < 2^j$. For $S_t(s) = [s - t]$, with $[s] = \max(-\infty, s) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ being the integer part, we have $S_t(t) = 0$ and the following equivalences become completely elementary:

Any orthogonal process on B is a.e. continuous at t if and only if any orthogonal process on $S_t(B)$ is a.e. continuous at 0 and at 1.

There exists an orthogonal process on B a.e. discontinuous at t if and only if there exists an orthogonal process on $S_t(B)$ a.e. discontinuous at 0 or a.e. discontinuous at 1.

Assuming $[t-\frac{1}{k}, t+\frac{1}{k}] \in [0,1]$, we have

$$V(H_B \cap 1_{[t-\frac{1}{k}, t+\frac{1}{k}]}) < \infty$$

if and only if

$$V(H_{S_t(B)} \cap 1_{[0,\frac{1}{k}]}) < \infty$$

and

$$V(H_{S_t(B)} \cap 1_{[\frac{k-1}{k},1]}) < \infty.$$

Lemma 6.3 is thus proved for any $t \in [0,1]$. □

6.8. Example. Any orthogonal process on the Cantor set $C \subset [0,1]$ has an a.e. continuous version.

Indeed, for the information function H_C we have the estimates

$$||(H_C - k)^+|| \leq \sum_{l \geq k} (\frac{2}{3})^k = 3(\frac{2}{3})^k$$

and $\sum_{i \geq 0} ||(H_C - 2^i)^+|| < \infty$, hence obviously $VH_C < \infty$.

We add some remarks on orthogonal measures. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a probability space with Ω a (countable) union of atoms $\Omega = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \Omega_n$. Then $H(\omega) = -\log_3 P(\Omega_n)$ for $\omega \in \Omega_n$ is, up to a constant factor, the classical information function on Ω. Assume for simplicity, that $H \geq 1$.

6.9. Definition. A function $m : \mathcal{F} \to L_2(\mathbb{R})$ is an orthogonal measure if

i) $||m(A)||^2 = P(A)$ for $A \in \mathcal{F}$;

ii) $m(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} A_n) = \sum_{n \geq 1} m(A_n)$ in L_2-norm, for any mutually disjoint sets $A_1, A_2, \cdots \in \mathcal{F}$.

As a refolmulation of the classical results of Moric and Tandori, we have

6.10. Theorem. A. *The equality* $m(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} A_n) = \sum_{n \geq 1} m(A_n)$ *is a.e. valid for any orthogonal measure and any disjoint sets* $A_1, A_2, \cdots \in \mathcal{F}$ *if and only if* $\sum_{i \geq 0} ||H_i|| < \infty$.

B. *A sequence $m(B_n)$ is almost everywhere divergent for some orthogonal measure m and some $B_1 \supset B_2 \supset \dots$ in $\mathcal{F}$ if and only if $\sum_{i\geq 0} ||H_i|| = \infty$.*

As before $H_i = H \wedge 2^{i+1} - H \wedge 2^i$, $i \geq 0$.

Proof. Any sequence $m(B_n)$, $n \geq 1$, for $B_1 \supset B_2 \supset \dots$, $\bigcap_{n\geq 1} B_n = \emptyset$, can be identified with some tails

$$\sum_{p\geq k(n)} m(\Omega_{\sigma(p)}), \quad n \geq 1,$$

of some rearranged series $\sum_{n\geq 1} m(\Omega_{\sigma(n)})$.

Part A is thus a consequence of Theorem 1.7 B.

Part B is also easy to obtain, using 1.7 B.

6.11. Stationary processes. For a stationary process (in weak sense) $X : \mathbb{R} \to L_2$, the investigation of a.e. continuity requires a special approach. It is only suggested by our results on information function. For example

$$\sum_{k\geq 0} (2^k (4||X(2^{-k-1}) - X(0)||^2 - ||X(2^{-k}) - X(0)||^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$$

proves to be a sufficient condition, in some sense the weakest possible. More details will be given in a subsequent paper.

References

[1] P. Billingsley, *Probability and measure* (2nd ed.), New York: Wiley, (1986).

[2] B.S. Kashin, A.A. Saakyan, *Orthogonal series*, Transitions of mathematical monographs, vol. 75, Amer. Math. Soc. (1989).

[3] F. Móricz, K. Tandori, *An improved Menshov-Rademacher theorem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **124** (1996), 877-885.

[4] A. Paszkiewicz, *A new proof of Rademacher-Menshov theorem*, to appear in Acta Scient. Math.

[5] M. Talagrand, *Convergence of orthogonal series using stochastic processes*, preprint.

[6] M. Weber, *Some theorems related to almost sure convergence of orthogonal series*, Indag. Math., N.S **11** (2000), 293-311.